

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY  
  
3 1761 00371633 9

# Cornell University

Ithaca, New York

## CORNELL STUDIES

IN

## CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT

AND

GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL.

NO. XIV

A Study in Case Rivalry being an Investigation Regarding the Use  
of the Genitive and the Accusative in Latin with Verbs of  
Remembering and Forgetting.

BY

CLINTON L. BABCOCK

PA  
25  
C7  
V.14

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1901













Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York

---

CORNELL STUDIES  
IN  
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY  
CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT  
AND  
GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL

No. XIV

A Study in Case Rivalry being an Investigation Regarding the Use  
of the Genitive and the Accusative in Latin with Verbs of  
Remembering and Forgetting.

BY  
CLINTON L. BABCOCK

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY  
BY  
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
1901

# A STUDY IN CASE RIVALRY

BEING AN

INVESTIGATION REGARDING THE USE OF THE  
GENITIVE AND THE ACCUSATIVE IN  
LATIN WITH VERBS OF REMEM-  
BERING AND FORGETTING.

BY

CLINTON L. BABCOCK

---

CORNELL STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, No. XIV.

---

80339  
18/9/56

COPYRIGHT, 1901,  
BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY

—  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PA  
25  
C7  
4 14

ITHACA, N. Y.  
PRESS OF ANDRUS & CHURCH  
1901

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
<b>INTRODUCTION . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PART ONE : HISTORY OF VIEWS . . . . .</b>	<b>3</b>
The Ancient Grammarians . . . . .	3
The Partitive Theory—Reisig, Clairin . . . . .	4
The Substantive Theory—Dräger, Guardia and Wierzeyski, Kühner, Deecke, Schottmüller, Haase . . . . .	6
Explanations Based on Signification—Madvig, Riemann and Goelzer, Greenough, Donaldson, Gossrau, Schmalz, Zumpt, Lane, Bennett . . . . .	10
<b>PART TWO : COLLECTION OF MATERIAL . . . . .</b>	<b>16</b>
Early Latin . . . . .	16
Ciceronian Age . . . . .	21
Examples with <i>de</i> and the Ablative . . . . .	29
Augustan Age . . . . .	32
Supplementary Examples . . . . .	41
Tables . . . . .	46
<b>PART THREE : DETERMINATION OF USAGE AND MEANING . . . . .</b>	<b>49</b>
I. Critical . . . . .	49
A. The Partitive Theory . . . . .	49
B. The Substantive Theory . . . . .	52
C. Explanations Based on Signification . . . . .	55
II. Constructive . . . . .	61
A. Summary of Usage . . . . .	61
Memini . . . . .	61
Obliviscor . . . . .	64
Recordor, Reminiscor . . . . .	65
Commemini . . . . .	66
Table Showing Personal Usage . . . . .	67
B. Deductions and Conclusions . . . . .	68
General Summary . . . . .	73



## INTRODUCTION.

It is a recognized fact that many of the statements touching Latin syntax, generally accepted as true, rest upon slight foundation. One after another, trusted "rules" have been weighed in the balance of exhaustive research, and found wanting, till the careful scholar finds himself regarding with great reserve even the most plausible statements of traditional grammar, unless those statements have been amply verified by thorough investigation. Unfortunately the number of instances in which such investigations have been made is comparatively few. This paper is presented in the hope that it may add one more to the list.

Primarily the object has been to present a complete, classified, list of all the examples in point that occur in extant Latinity down to the end of the Augustan period. No effort has been spared toward the attainment of this object. Sometimes, where no reliable index was available, a standard text has been carefully read the second time, lest any examples should escape notice. This has been done in the case of Plautus, and Terence, and Cicero's *Letters*. The accuracy of the text has been tested in the case of each example and the reading discussed when necessary. In spite of all precautions, however, it is possible that some few examples have been omitted. Moreover, scattered fragments, not found in standard collections such as the *Poetae Latini Minores* of Baehrrens, and the *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta* of Ribbeck, have not been hunted out. All material belonging to the post-Augustan period has been gleaned from lexicons and indexes. Some of these were good and some were not. No effort has been made toward completeness of the material belonging to this period of the language, but examples, so far as given, have been verified and are accurate. They are valuable as throwing light upon the later development of the construction which forms the subject of this paper, and they probably cover over seventy-

five per cent. of the instances occurring in the entire period from which they are drawn.

Two other objects have been kept in mind; and the three, treated separately, give rise to the division of the paper into three parts. Part One contains a collection of the statements regarding the subject made by scholars both ancient and modern, with an occasional criticism of statements of fact. Part Two contains the material gathered in the present investigation, as described above. Part Three includes criticisms of theories quoted in Part One, together with such independent suggestions and conclusions as may seem warranted by Part Two.

## PART ONE.

### HISTORY OF VIEWS.

Cicero, *de Div.* I, 63, writes *meminit praeteritorum*. In *de Fin.* I, 62, he writes *praeterita meminit*. Why? The following pages are devoted to an attempt to answer the general question of which this is a particular instance: Why did the Romans use now the genitive and now the accusative with verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting*?

The ancient grammarians have little or nothing to say about the matter. If they mention it at all, it is generally to quote without comment examples of the genitive and accusative with these verbs, under the heading “*Exempla Elocutionum*.” However, Caper and after him Beda (see Keil, VII, pp. 92, 282) make the following positive statement: *Oblitus ne sis nostri, non nos : veteres tamen et hoc modo diverunt.* This is wholly without explanation or comment. Nonius (L. Müller, 1888, Part II, p. 136 ff.), under the heading *De Numeris et Casibus*, makes the following interesting classification: *Accusativus pro genitivo.* dum homines perdit i hastam illam cruentam meminerint et sperabunt. M. Tullius, *de off.* II.

alternos Musae meminisse volebant. Vergilius in *Bucolicis*.

meminere officium suum. Plautus, *Cistellaria*.

propterea illius nomen memini facilius. *Menacchmis*.

hen me miserum cum haec recordor, cum illos reminiscor dies.

Accius, *Eurydice*.

veritus sum arbitros; adque utinam memet possim obliiscier.

Athamante,

an ego Ulixem oblisear umquam aut quemquam praeponi velim?

Nyctegresia,

iam desine meminisse illius formam. Turpilius, *Pedio*.

adque ipsa mens, quae futura videt, praeterita meminit.

M. Tullius, *de re publica*, IV.

libet epigrammatia facere et quoniam nomina  
non memini, siquod in solum mi venerit,  
ponam. Varro, *Vae victis*, περὶ φιλονικίας.  
mea facta in acie oblii—Accius, *Myrmidonibus*.

Note the fact that while Nomins finds instances in plenty of ‘accusativus pro genetivo’, he detects no case of ‘genetivus pro accusativo’.

Of the modern attempts to solve the problem with which we are dealing, practically all date within the last seventy-five years. There have been many of them, but, since they are based upon insufficient data, they are, for the most part, either incomplete or incorrect. They may be grouped under three general classes. First, those that assert that the genitive when used after verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting* is the so-called partitive genitive. Second, those that regard this genitive as due to the substantive idea inhering in the verb. Third, those that attempt to explain it on the basis of other significations.

The most prominent advocate of the first theory is Karl Reisig (*Vorlesungen über Lat. Sprachwissenschaft*, 1888, p. 570 ff.). “With the genitive,” says Reisig, “one thinks of a part of the whole. Some assert that with *memini* an accusative of the person is not used,<sup>1</sup> but the genitive. However, there is a distinction between the two cases. With the genitive you think at once of the ‘Prädikat’ of the person whom you remember, namely of the personality. It is presupposed that you have learned to know the person. This is not the case when the accusative is used, which occurs only when one is thinking of the object in general, without knowing the personality. This is proved by instances from Cicero, where the contrast is brought out between remembrance and acquaintance, *Phil.* V, 6, 17, *Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem*. The former he knew from history, the last two he had himself seen. *Lael.* 2, 9, *memineram Paullum, videram*

---

<sup>1</sup> This is not true. There are 20 instances of *memini* with an accusative of the person.

*Gallum ; de Orat.* III, 50, 194. *Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe meministi.* [The editor, Landgraf, here interposes the remark that these examples go, on the other hand, to show that *memini* with the accusative of a person is used when you have in mind one who has lived in your time or whom you yourself have known] *Memini de aliquo* is also legitimate, but it means ‘to make mention of.’

“ With *oblivisci* also the genitive is distinctly different from the accusative, for in certain instances the genitive is absolutely necessary, as for example, if not a whole thing is to be or can be represented as forgotten, but only an impression which it has made. So *oblivisci rei* means to forget an impression of a thing, where you still know the fact. This indication becomes necessary, if you are speaking of an intentional disappearance from the memory. Now one cannot forget insults, but one may very well destroy the impression, thus one says *iniuriarum oblivisci* (*Caes. B. G.* I, 14). Only thus can one explain the union with *omnium*, as in *Cic. de Fin.* V, 20, 57, *omnium ceterarum rerum oblii*: ‘von allen Dingen etwas vergessen’.”

Haase, in a footnote, declares that Reisig is entirely in error. Haase himself thinks that these verbs were originally intransitive. He also calls attention to the fact that even in the case of injuries we have several times the accusative, as *Cic. pro Cael.* 20, 50.

P. Clairin (*Du Génitif Latin et de la Préposition De*, Paris, 1880, p. 40) says: “ It is not always easy to affirm with certainty why certain verbs of transitive meaning take an object in the genitive, and the most ingenious conjectures ought not to take the place of actual explanations. Many suggest an ellipsis of a substantive. Now even if in certain instances one should recognize the ellipsis of a substantive, yet in others it is the verb itself that appears to take its object in the genitive. Without doubt *meminisse* equals *habere memoriam*; but, as it is quite as true that *amare* equals *habere amorem*, why should one not also put the object of the verb *amare* in the genitive? These explanations only postpone and sometimes augment the difficulty which they pretend to explain.

"The connection easily established between verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting* and the adjectives *memor* and *immemor* is not sufficient to explain this construction, common to Greek and Latin. If you can recognize the partitive idea in the genitive employed in Greek with verbs which signify an operation of the mind, can you not have recourse to the same explanation for the genitive joined to verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting*, the memory not being the object itself, but only a part of the object? In support of this is the fact that the same verbs take an object in the accusative in the sense of 'to know': *Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe meministi*, Cic. *De Orat.* iii, 50, 194."

Among those who favor the second theory, *i. e.*, that the genitive is due to the substantive idea inhering in the verb, may be mentioned Draeger (*Historische Syntax*, Vol. I, 1878, p. 488 ff.), but he adds that the language was always unsettled in these expressions and that often the accusative is used in place of the genitive. "In classical Latin and later the genitive is everywhere the more common, and appears even with neuter pronouns if their neuter origin is evident from the context." Draeger then inserts a paragraph headed "Statt des Genetivs steht der Accusativ", giving the instances, as did Nonius, without further comment.

He continues: "With *recordari* the accusative is always the more usual, especially in the works of Cicero, who uses the genitive with this verb only three times":<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> No one of these instances is in point. Let us examine them in detail. The first passage, with its context, is as follows: *Atque haec dicere vix audeo; verbor, ne qui sit, qui istius insignem nequitiam frontis involutam integrumentis nondum cernat; dicam tamen. Ipse certe agnoscer et cum aliquo dolore flagitiorum suorum recordabitur.* G. W. Goßrau (*Lat. Sprachlehre*, 1880, § 267, 2) calls attention to the fact that the genitive here is not the object of *recordor*. "Both *agnoscer* and *recordabitur* refer to *nequitiam* in the previous sentence, and the genitive depends on *dolore*." One can hardly dispute this after a careful examination of the passage, especially in view of the fact that, if *flagitiorum* is to be construed with *recordabitur*, it must stand as positively the only instance in which Cicero uses the genitive with that verb, for it will presently be shown that the other

*in Pis.* 6, flagitorum suorum.

*pro Planc.* 28, huins meriti.

*ad Att.* iv, 17,<sup>1</sup> superioris tuae transmissionis.

Both in view of these examples, and those previously quoted, it seems likely that the accusative occurs when these verbs mean to have something in memory, in knowledge. Only it is certain that the accusative of pronouns and adjectives serves to make distinguishable their neuter gender. (*Cf.* Madvig, *Gramm.* § 291, Anm. 1.)"

Guardia and Wierzeyski (*Grammaire de la Langue Latine*, 1876, p. 452) also think that the genitive is to be explained by a certain substantive notion residing in the verb. They add: "Although the usage varies and the accusative often replaces the genitive, the latter is the more usual, even with neuter pronouns, when the neuter can be recognized in the context. The construction with the accusative belongs also to the ante-classical period."

Kühner (*Ausführliche Gramm. der Lat. Sprache*, 1873, Vol. II, p. 344 ff.) is another who holds this theory. The accusative, he says, means *memoria rem [non] teneo, in memoriam rezoco*. In the case of persons it is used when one has in mind someone who has lived in one's time and whom one has known personally.

This last remark, regarding persons, is made also by Deecke (*Lat. Gr.*, § 256), who has no further suggestions to offer concerning the matter.

---

two alleged instances are beyond a doubt not to be so taken; *pro Planc.* 28, *huius meriti* is corrupt. There seems to be absolutely no manuscript authority for it. All recent editors read *meritum*. The mistake was made only by the earlier editors.

In *ad Att.* IV, 19, the accepted text is *quam me hercule ego valde timebam recordans superioris tuae transmissionis δέππεις* where δέππεις is obviously the object of the participle. This is the view of Tyrrell, (*The Correspondence of Cicero*, 1886, vol. ii, p. 191), of I. C. G. Boot (*Ep. Ciceronis ad Att.*, p. 213) and of E. S. Shuckburgh, in his translation of the *Letters*, published in 1899. Under the head of *recordor* with the genitive, the Merguet lexicons give the passage from *in Pisonem* commented on above, and also *ut recordemini illius L. Metelli, pontificis maximi: pro Scaur.* 48. But *ut recordemini* is here a conjecture made to fill a lacuna (see text of C. F. W. Müller). Obviously it cannot be correct.

<sup>1</sup>This passage is variously cited as *ad Att.* IV, 17, and *ad Att.* IV, 19.

Alfred Schottmüller (*Lat. Schulgrammatik*, 1884, p. 227) declares: "The genitive, common with these verbs, necessitates the supplying of the accusative *memoriam* with verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting*, and of the nominative *memoria* with *venit mihi in mentem*. These verbs often have the accusative, where *meminisse aliquem* means 'to bethink oneself of someone' and where the word *memoria* would be out of place."

The scholars thus far quoted have in the main been conservative, admitting that the cases, when referring to things, are frequently used without apparent difference of meaning. There follows one of the most lengthy discussions of the subject that have yet been made, in which the author states his distinction and then cites examples to prove that the genitive and accusative are always quite distinct in meaning, except possibly in the case of neuter pronouns.

Friedrich Haase, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, 1874, II, p. 76:

"The verbs *reminisci*, *oblivisci*, *recordari*, *meminisse* take the genitive or the accusative with a distinction which results naturally from the character of the case. Reisig, § 356, would make use of the partitive idea in the case of the genitive, and derives his distinction by saying that, when the accusative is used, one has in mind the whole thing, but when the genitive is used, only an impression of it; but that is wholly wrong; cf. Weissenborn *Synt.* §§ 89 and 144. The genitive is rather the more distinct expression of the relative adjectival idea of *memor* and *immemor* that resides in these verbs. Thus with the genitive there is expressed only the state of remembering. While the object is specified, there is not the free play of the intellect which has or has not laid firm hold of the object, as is the case with the accusative."

"Thus when Cie., *Phil.* V, 6, 17, says: *Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem*, he merely wishes to remark that he has known these men. He has seen Caesar and Sulla, and his ability to remember reaches to Cinna. He can remember the former and he carries the latter in his recollection. The connection with *vidi* shows that here he would refer to mental activity only and noth-

ing more. On the other hand had he said *Cinnae memini*, more would have been involved. Then his ability to remember would be so circumscribed owing to Cinna, that he could not separate himself from him, that he could not forget him, as, for instance, if he were closely connected with him by ties of affection, or if Cinna had so impressed himself on his memory that he was not in a position to get free from him; under such circumstances then his memory is limited and determined by the nature of the situation, and is not a free activity by virtue of which he may call to mind Cinna if he wish, or may refrain from doing so, if he prefer. Of persons, this accusative is rare; the genitive frequent. Very naturally, for it is the usual thing that persons should be brought before one in their natural connection of love, friendship, etc. One person is mindful of another by virtue of natural inclination.

"Another example: Caesar says, *B. G.* I, 14, 3, *Quod si veteris contumeliae oblivisci vellet, num etiam recentium iniuriarum memoriam deponere posse?* That would surely appear to be a free act; it is a question of pardoning or not pardoning. But a man naturally, and as a matter of duty, is mindful of an insult offered his people. It is a grievance which one carries in his heart whether or no, the memory of which is thus involuntary. Caesar now says that even if he should cast out one such recollection, yet this would be impossible in the case of the recent grievance.

"On the other hand Cicero, *pro Cael.* 20, 50, paints Clodia as a well known woman about town who plied her trade so openly that on her part there could be no talk of adultery, of which Caelius had been guilty with her. Then he further says: *Obliviscor iam iniurias, Clodia, depono memoriam doloris mei, quae abs te crudeliter in meos me absente facta sunt, neglego.* Here Cicero for the moment, *iam*, really forgets his grievance by virtue of a free act, and from voluntary resolution does not mention it. The following verbs, *depono* and *neglego* show that.

"Cicero, *pro Ligar.* 12, 35, *Equidem, cum tuis omnibus negotiis interesserem, memoria teneo, qualis T. Ligarius quaestor urbanus fuerit erga te et dignitatem tuam. Sed parum est me hoc me-*

*minisse : spero etiam te, qui oblivious nihil soles nisi iniurias, quoniam hoc est animi, quoniam etiam ingeni tui, te aliquid de huius illo quaestorio officio etiam de aliis quibusdam quaestoribus reminiscentem recordari.* It is certain that Cicero here in flattery of Caesar puts the power of his remarkable memory along side of praise of his personal character. Later he says *animus* and *ingenium*; ‘you are not accustomed to forget’ (that is the force of the *ingenium*) ; ‘only for injuries do you appear to have no memory’ (that is the force of the *animus*) ; but Cicero treats it as if it too were a matter of the *ingenium*, and if he, Cicero, although he was under no obligation to remember it, had not forgotten the services of T. Ligarius in behalf of Caesar, so much the less would Caesar forget it, since it concerned him, and since he was not accustomed to forget, least of all to forget kindnesses.

“Cicero, *de Fin.* V, 20, 57, *quo studio cum satiari non possint, omnium ceterarum rerum obliiti nihil abiectum, nihil humile cogitant.* The discussion is about men who do not concern themselves either with private or public business, but devote themselves to mental activity, so completely that they are unable to get enough of it, although they think of nothing else. It is certainly their wish ; they have begun through a free act to forget all other things, but Cicero represents them as arrived at the point where without freedom of choice they are forgetful of all other things through the fact that their inclination is directed exclusively in other directions.

“I hope that this explanation of the examples has proven that in such instances the direct object has its own fixed meaning and that it is not at all identical in signification with the genitive. One may grant merely this (*cf.* Zumpt § 440) that the neuters, as *hoc, illud, cetera, etc.*, usually stand in the accusative, because one avoids the genitive, which it is not possible to recognize as nenter. But doubtless also in this case the accusative must be suitable, or else one would say, as Cie. *l. c., omnium ceterarum rerum, or huius rei, etc.*”

We come now to the theories of those who would distinguish between the two cases on the basis of differences of signification

other than those already considered. Sometimes the distinction is not very sharp between these views and those included in our preceding group, but it is enough so to serve for the purpose of convenient arrangement. Madvig's statement is given first (Madvig-Thacher, *Grammar*, § 291): "The accusative is often put with those verbs which signify *to remember* and *to forget*,—most frequently with *memini*,—when they denote *to have a thing in the memory* (*knowledge of a thing*) or the reverse (but not *to think of a thing* or *not to think of it*.)"

Riemann and Goelzer (*Grammaire Comparée*, p. 140) say: "When *memini* and *obliviscor* have for object the name of a thing, you often find this object in the accusative. Under such circumstances the meaning of *memini* is 'to keep in memory' and of *obliviscor* 'not to keep in memory.' On the other hand, with an object in the genitive these verbs signify 'to have (or not to have) a recollection of.'

"When the object is the name of a person, *memini* alone can be construed with the accusative.<sup>1</sup>

"The verb *recordor* is ordinarily accompanied by an object which is the name of a thing. The case is the accusative. When the object of *recordor* is the name of a person, it has regularly the ablative preceded by *de*. In familiar<sup>2</sup> speech one finds also *memini de aliquo* and *memini de aliqua re*. The idea of 'to make mention of' is sometimes rendered in Latin by *memini* accompanied by the genitive, but the example which is cited (Caes. *B. C.*, III, 108, 2) cannot rest on the authority of Caesar, if it be true that chapters 108 and 112 of this book were written partly by Asinius Pollio."

Two of the most radical statements are those of J. B. Greenough (*Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar*,) and of John Wm.

<sup>1</sup> This would appear to be incorrect, in view of Livius Andronicus, *Odisia*, 4: Accius, *Athamas*, II, 190, and *Nyctegresia*, VI, 488; Virgil, *Aen.*, II, 148,—four instances in which *obliviscor* is followed by an accusative of the person.

<sup>2</sup> The accuracy of this statement is doubtful. Cf. Cic. *Leg. Agr.*, II, 2, 3; *Phil.*, II, 36, 91. The usage is rare.

Donaldson (*A Complete Latin Grammar*, Camb. 1867). As will be seen, they are diametrically opposed to one another. Greenough says (p. 213, § 219), "Verbs of *Remembering* and *Forgetting* take the Genitive of the object when they are used of a *continued state of mind*, but the accusative when used of a *single act*: as,—

I. Genitive :—

*recordans superioris transmissionis* (*Att.* IV, 19), 'remembering your former crossing'.<sup>1</sup>

*animus meminit praeteritorum* (*Div.* i, 30) 'the soul remembers the past'.

*venit mihi in mentem illius dici*, 'I bethink me of that day'.

*obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum* (*Cat.* i, 3), 'turn your mind from slaughter and conflagrations'.

*nec umquam obliviscar illius noctis* (*Planc.* 42, 101), 'and I shall never forget that night'.

II. Accusative :—

*totam causam oblitus est* (*Brut.* 60), 'he forgot the whole case'.

*pueritiae memoriam recordari* (*Arch.* i) 'to recall the memory of childhood'.

a. The Accusative is almost always used of a person or thing remembered by an eye-witness: as,—

*meminoram Paullum* (*Lael.*) 'I remembered Paulus'.

b. *Recordor*, 'recollect', 'recall', denotes a single act and is therefore almost always followed by the Accusative: as—

*recordare consensum illum theatri* (*Phil.* i, 30.) 'recall that unanimous agreement of the (the audience in the) theatre'.

*recordamini omnis civilis dissensiones* (*Cat.* iii, 24), 'recall all the civil wars'".

Donaldson (l. l., p. 279) says: "The genitive of the object is used generally with verbs of *remembering*, *reminding*, and *forgetting*, as *memini*, *admoneo*, *reminiscor*, *recordor*, and *obliviscor*; but they sometimes take an accusative, especially when they denote

---

<sup>1</sup> In the note on the quotation from Draeger (see above p. 6) it has been shown that the genitive is here not the object of *recordor*.

'to have a thing in memory', 'to have knowledge of a thing', or the reverse, rather than 'to call it to mind' or 'think of it'; thus we find *stultum est eorum meminisse, propter quae tui oblivisceris* 'it is foolish to remember those things on account of which you are forgetful of yourself'; but, *Antipatrum tu probe meministi*, 'you retain Antipater in your recollection—you still remember him'; *homines non modo res praeclarissimas obliviscuntur, sed etiam nefarias suspicantur*, 'men not only forget (are continually forgetful of) the most illustrious actions, but they even suspect wickednesses'.

Obs. 1. *Recordor*, 'I think of', almost always governs the accusative; and we have also the ablative with *de*: as *de illis lacrimis recordor*. Similarly we have *de illo ne meminisse quidem volo*. The poets use *obliviscor* with an accusative of the person."

G. W. Gossrau (*Lat. Sprachlehre*, 1880, § 267) says that *obliviscor* can take the accusative of things, also of persons in the sense of 'to give up'. Of *reminiscor* he says that there is no instance in Cicero where this verb alone governs a case, except *Att. IV, 2, reminiscebatur enim Kal. Jan.*, where we cannot tell what the case is. This appears to be true. There is an instance in *ad Fam.*, IV, 5, 5, but the letter was written by Servius, not by Cicero.

Various scholars confine themselves to statements of fact, with little or no attempt to distinguish or explain the usages. Among them is J. H. Schmalz (*Latinische Syntax, Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, II,<sup>3</sup> 2, 1900, p. 241, § 67), who says: "With verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting*, the use of the genitive outweighs that of the accusative except in early Latin, where, in Plautus for instance, *obliviscor* is construed only with the accusative. *Recordare*, however, even in classical Latin generally has the accusative; in Cicero the only instances of the genitive are *ad Att. IV, 17, 1*, and *in Pisonem 12*. In the comic poets and from them on everywhere, these verbs occur also with *de*. Cicero always uses *recordor* with *de* when referring to persons. In early

<sup>1</sup> The italics are mine.

Latin *venit in mentem* is followed by the substantive in the genitive or by *de* with ablative. In Cicero always by genitive; in the case of pronouns the nominative is used. In Livy and later writers the nominative appears to predominate, even in the case of substantives."

Notice here also the error of regarding *Att.* 4, 17, 1, and *in Pisonem* 12 as instances of the genitive with *recordor*; see above p. 6, N.

Here also I shall include :

C. G. Zumpt, *A Grammar of the Latin Language*, translated by Leonhard Schmitz, 1847, § 439 : "With verbs of *reminding*, *remembering*, and *forgetting*, the person or the thing of which any one reminds another or oneself, or which one forgets, is expressed by the genitive; but there are many instances also in which the thing is expressed by the accusative.

" § 440. NOTE. With regard to the accusative of the thing, it must be observed that the neutrals of pronouns, and neuter adjectives used as substantives, are joined to the above mentioned verbs only in the accusative; for their genitive would present no difference from the masculine gender. . . . . An accusative of the person is very rarely used with these verbs; but *memini*, in the sense of 'I remember a person who lived in my time,' is invariably joined with an accusative of the person. . . . Sometimes verbs of *reminding* and *remembering* take the preposition *de*; *memini* takes *de* more especially when it signifies *mentionem facere*; but the genitive also may be used. With *venit mihi in mentem*, the person or thing may be put in the nominative, so as to become the subject."

Among recent American Grammars may be mentioned those of G. M. Lane (1898) and of C. E. Bennett (1895). Neither author offers any theory as to the distinction between the cases when referring to things. When referring to persons, the latter thinks that *memui* takes the genitive in the significations: *I bear in mind* (*memor sum*), *am mindful of*, or *make mention of*; but the accusative in the signification, *I recall*. *Obliviscor*, he says, regularly takes the genitive. Professor Bennett does not make

the mistake of including *recordor* in the list of verbs governing the genitive. Professor Lane does; aside from that his statements are conservative and not important to note here.

It will thus be seen that there is considerable difference of opinion regarding the principle of distinction in the choice between the two cases, especially when referring to things. There is, however, practical unanimity in distinguishing the use with things from that with persons, though we do not find perfect agreement in the theories advanced to explain that difference. The opinion most often expressed seems to be that the accusative (with *memini*) points to the fact that the person remembered either had lived in the time of the speaker or was known personally to him.

Criticisms of statements made regarding *obliviscor* and *recordor* occur in connection with the statements themselves, as cited above.

The fact is generally recognized that neuter pronouns and adjectives in the neuter gender used substantively are put in the accusative, and this is explained by saying that otherwise the gender would not be known. It is further stated that in Livy and later we find, even with these neutrals, the genitive, where their neuter gender may be seen from the context. The present investigation has shown that this statement regarding neutrals may be extended, as will appear later.

The use of *de* with the ablative with these verbs has been touched upon briefly, also the construction following the phrase *venit mihi in mentem*. Statistics regarding the extent of these constructions will be found in their proper place. The treatment of these two usages, however, is only incidental, and does not come properly within the scope of this paper.

## PART II.

### COLLECTION OF MATERIAL.

The following pages contain all the instances in extant Latin literature, down to the end of the Augustan period, in which a verb of *remembering* or *forgetting* occurs with a direct object in either the genitive or the accusative case.

#### APPIUS CLAUDIUS. .

Obliviscor.

*Sententiae* 2 (*Frag. Poet. Rom.*) : Amicum cum vides, *obligere* miserias commentis; si est inimicus, nec libens aequo.

#### LIVIUS ANDRONICUS.

Obliviscor.

*Odisia*, 4: Neque tamen *te oblitus sum*, Laertie noster. Cf. Homer, *Od.* 1, 65, πῶς ἀν̄ ἔπειτ' Ὁδυσῆος ἐγὼ θείοι λαθοίμην;

#### PLAUTUS.

Memini.

With the genitive: (I) of the person (II); of the thing.

I.

*Persa*, 494: Faciam ut *mei memineris*, dum vitam vivas.

II.

*Persa*, 658: Satin ut *meminit libertatis?*

I and II.

*Captivi*, 800: Faciam ut huius *dici locique meique semper meminerit.*

With the accusative: (I) of the person (II); of the thing.

## I.

*Aul.* 542 : Pro re nitorem et gloriam pro copia qui habent meminerint sese unde oriundi sient.

*Truc.* 220 : Nos divitem istum *meminimus* atque iste pauperes nos.

## II.

*Merc.* 1011 : Suam quisque homo *rem meminit*.

*Menaech.* 618 : Taceo iam, quando haec *rem non meminit* suam.

*Cist.* 148 : Siquid usus venerit *meminisse* ego hanc *rem* vos volo.

*Poen.* 1062 : Ecquid *meministi* tuom parentum *nomina*?

*Menaech.* 45 : illius *nomen memini* faciliss.

*Cas.* 260 : Mirum, ecastor, te senecta aetate *officium* tuom non *meminisse*!

*Stichus,* 42 : Moneo ut tuom *memineris officium*.

*Stichus,* 46 : omnibus obnixe opibus nostrum *officium meminisse* decet.

*M. Glor.* 1378 : Ne me moneatis : *memini* ego *officium meum*.

*Cist.* 381 : *meminere officium suom*.

*Trin.* 697 : Is est houos homini pudico *meminisse officium suom*.

*Persa,* 186 : *omnia memini*.

*M. Glor.* 354 : *Praecepta facito ut memineris.*

## Obliviscor.

*Trin.* 1013 : Satin in thermipolio *condalium es oblitus*?

*Trin.* 1018 : tribusne te poteriis *memoriam esse oblitum*.

*Cas.* 104 : Chaline, non *sum oblitus officium meum*.

*Bacch.* 790 : *oblitus sum omnia*.

## Commemini.

*Trin.* 1027 : *Commemini domi*.

*Pseud.* 696 : *Commemini omnia*.

This verb is used with a neut. pron. as object in *Amph.* 254, *Circ.* 493, *Mil.* *Glor.* 914, *Poen.* 726 and 985. The word is found about fourteen times in Plautus.

## Recordor.

*Most.* 85 : *Recordatus multum*.

*Menaech.* 972 : *Recordetur id*.

**Neuter Pronouns.**

Neuter pronouns occur as objects in Plautus : after *memini* thirteen times ; after *obliviscor* once ; always in the accusative.

**CATO.****Memini.**

*Orig.* ii, 1 : Ligures . . . inliterati mendacesque sunt et *vera* minus *meminere*.

**TERENCE.****Memini.**

With the genitive : (I) of the person ; (II) of the thing.

## I.

*Heaut.* 951 : . . . ut dum vivat *meminerit semper mei*.

## II.

*Eun.* 815 : Sanga, ita ut fortis decet milites, *domi focique fac* vicissim *ut memineris*.

*Heaut.* 1026 : Obsecro, *eius (temporis) ut memineris*.

## I and II.

*Eun.* 801 : Faciam ut huius loci dieique meique semper *memineris*.

**Obliviscor.**

With the genitive of the person.

*Eun.* 306 : Nescio hercule, neque unde eam, neque quorsum eam ; ita prorsum *oblitus sum mei*.

*Andriae, Alter Exitus,* 983 : ne me esse *oblitum* dicas tuae gnatae alterae.

**Reminiscor.**

With the accusative of the thing.

*Heeyra,* 385 : Sed quom *orata eins reminiscor*, nequeo quin lacrimum miser.

**Neuter Pronouns.**

Neuter Pronouns in the accusative occur in Terence after *memini* three times. There is one in the genitive after this verb, quoted above.

**SEXTUS TURPILIUS.**

Memini.

*Paedium*, IV, 155: *Meminisse illius formam.*

(Nonius P. II, p. 137, Müller: "accusativus pro genitivo".)

**CAECILIUS STADIUS.**

Obliviscor.

*Harpazomene*, V, 61: *Equi homo ineptitudinis cumulatus cultum oblitus es?*

**PACUVIUS.**

Recordor.

*Armorum Judicium*, XII, 36: *Cum recordor eius ferocem et torvam confidentiam.*

**ACCIUS.**

Recordor.

*Eurysaces*, VIII, 346: *cum hacc recordor.*

Reminiscor.

*Eurysaces*, VIII, 346: *Cum illos reminiscor dies.*

Obliviscor.

*Athamas*, II, 190: *Veritus sum arbitros; atque utinam memet possim obliisci.*

The following instance is given only because Nonius quotes it among other instances of what he calls "accusativus pro genitivo" (see p. 3). He omits the *esse*, which evidently should be read.

*Epinausimache*, XV: *Deorum mortalis, Phoenix, <esse> liberos reminiscor semper.*

This instance will not be considered a case in point.

*Nyctegresia*, VI, 488: *An ego *Uliven* obliiscar unquam aut quemquam praeponi velim. Cf. *Iliad*, X, 242—πῶς ἀντειρ' Ὀδυσῆος ἐγὼ θείοιο λαθούμην;*

**Neuter Pronouns.**

One example; in the accusative after *obliviscor*.

**The Participle Oblitus.**

*Myrmidones*, III, 12: *mea facta in acie oblii.*  
This may possibly be a finite use,—for *oblii sunt.*

**CLAUDIUS QUADRIGARIUS.**

**Memini.**

*Annales*, IX: *Qui prior bellum, quod cum his gestum erat, meminissent.*

**DECIMUS LABERIUS.**

**Obliviscor.**

*Necyomantia*, I: *Dum diutius retinetur, nostri oblitus est.*

**AD HERENNIVM.**

In the treatise Ad C. Herennium there are nine instances of *memini* used with an object. The object is always in the accusative case. Three are neuter pronouns. The others are as follows, all being of the thing.

II, 18, 27: . . . auditor cum totius causae tum unius cuiusque argumentationis distributionem percipere et *meminisse* poterit.

III, 16, 29: *Constat igitur artificiosa memoria ex locis et imaginibus . . . Imagines sunt formae quaedam et notae et simulacula eius rei, quam meminisse volumus.*

III, 20, 34: *quotiescumque rem meminisse volemus.*

III, 22, 37: *Nam, quas res facile meminimus casdem fictas . . . meminisse non difficile est.*

NOTE. P.<sup>2</sup> II. B. C. d. have *meminimus*, H. P. *minus*, b. l. *meminerimus*.

III, 17: *si multa meminisse volumus.*

III, 23, 38: *cum ex infinita verborum copia modo aliud modo aliud nos verbum meminisse oportebit.*

The following is given as throwing light upon the general meaning of *memini* throughout the treatise.

IV, 56: *Quae si sequimur . . . firme et perpetue meminerimus.*

## VARRO.

## Memini.

*Rerum Rust.* I, 2, 27 : Dicam . . . eisdem quibus ille verbis scripsit . . ; cum homini pedes dolere coepissent, qui *tui meminissent*, ei mederi posse.

*Ibid.* : Ego *tui memini*, medere meis pedibus.

*Sententiae* 127 : Sic *audita meminisse magni ducimus*.

*Satiræ Menipp.* (Riese, p. 117, 2.) : Libet me epigrammatia facere et, quoniam *nomina non memini*, quod in solum mihi veniret, ponam.

## CICERO.

We come now to an examination of the works of Cicero. The *Lexicon zu den Schriften Cicero's* by Merguet, Jena, 1877-94, was used for the orations and philosophical works. A personal examination was made of the text of the letters, rhetorical works, and fragments.

The examples are so numerous that the verbs will be treated separately.

## Memini.

With the genitive : (I) person ; (II) thing.

## I.

*Verr.* II, 136 : *ipse sui memineras*.

*Ad Fam.* XV, 17, 4 : Et, ambo te, cum dabis posthac aliquid domum litterarum, *mei meminoris*.

*De Fin.* V, 3 : . . . veteris proverbi admonitu *vivorum memini*.

*Ad Att.* X, 10, 1 : ei cum ego saepissime scripsisset nihil me contra Caesaris rationes cogitare, *meminisse me generi* *mei*, *meminisse amicitiae*.

*Ad Att.* XIII, 33, 4 : . . . sed ego ita egi, ut non scinderem paenulam, *memini enim tuum* ||*tui*|| et multi erant nosque imparati :

NOTE. There is manuscript authority for either reading ; I am unable to make a choice on the ground of the meaning, and the results of the present investigation show that either the accusative neuter of the adjective or the genitive of the pronoun

would be correct. Therefore I shall not include this in any figures subsequently given.

## II.

*Ad Att. X, 10, 1: meminisse amicitiae* (see 4th example under 1).

*Plane. 101: memini neque umquam obliviscar noctis illius.*

*Verr. II, 73: ut sui iuris dignitatisque meminisset.*

*De Div. I, 63: (animus) meminit praeteritorum, praesentia cernit, futura providet.*

*De Off. I, 122: caveant intemperantiam, meminerint verecundiae.*

*Ad Fam. I, 9, 8: Num potui magis in arcem illius cansae invadere aut magis obliisci temporum meorum, meminisse actionum?*

*Ad Fam. XIII, 75, 1: Quare velim mihi ignoscas, si . . . minus videbor meminisse constantiae tuae.*

With the accusative : (I) person ; (II) thing.

## I.

*Lae. 2, 9: Memineram Paulum, videram Galum.*

*Phil. V, 17: Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem.*

*Phil. II, 108: Memineramus Cinnam nimis potentem, Sullam postea dominantem, modo Caesarem reguantem videramus.*

*De Off. I, 114: Rupilius, quem ego memini.*

*Cato. 5, 14: Quem (Ennium) probe meminisse potestis.*

*De Fin. II, 63: L. Thorius Balbus fuit, Lanuvinus, quem meminisse tu non potes.*

*De Orat. III, 194: Quodsi Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe, Catule, meministi.*

*De Orat. III, 214: Quid fuit in Graccho, quem tu melius, Catule, meministi, quod . . . etc.*

*Q. Cic. De Petit. ad M. Frat. 9: Nam illis, quos meminimus, Gallis, qui tum Titiniorum, etc. . . . capita demebant, Sulla unum Catilinam praefecerat.*

*Ad Att. XIII, 30, 3: Ego memini Albinum consularem et Sp. Muminiuum.*

*Ad Fam.* IX, 22, 1 : 'modo forte—' nosti canticum; *meministi Roseum*: Ita me destituit nudum—'

*De Orat.* III, 133: *Meminerant illi Sex. Aelium.*

*Verr.* III, 190: *Quos innocentissimos meminimus.*

*Phil.* I, 34: Utinam *avum tuum meminisses!* (quoted by Merguet under *things*.)

## II.

*Cat.* III, 24: *quas* (dissensiones civilis) ipsi *meministis.*

*Imp. Pomp.* 47: *quam* (felicitatem) . . . *meminisse de altero possimus.*

*Post. Red.* 23: non est mei temporis *iniurias meminisse.*

*Phil.* I, 37: *tantam sollicitudinem bonorum tantam timorem omnium in quo meminimus?*

*Frag.* XIV, 3, 3: quis non *meminerit pueritiam tuam?*

*Phil.* IV, 1: *quantam* (contionem) *meminisse.*

*Sest.* 62: *meministis illum diem, cum etc.*

*De Off.* II, 29: dum homines perdit*i hastam illam cruentam et meminerint et sperabunt.*

*De Leg.* II, 46: hoc magis *eas res et memini et exspecto.*

*Ad Brut.* I, 10, 3: —nec vero ulla in re *memini aut senatum meliorem aut magistratus.*

*Ad Att.* XIII, 32, 2: Postumium antem, cuius *statuam* in Isthmo *meminisse te dicis, nesciebam fuisse etc.*

*Ad Att.* XI, 23, 3: *Memini omnino tuas litteras.*

*Ad Q. Frat.* II, 7, 1: Quod me . . . admones, ut *meminerim Jovis orationem* quae est in extremo illo libro, ego vero *memini.*

*Ad Q. Frat.* III, 1, 1: ego ex magnis caloribus (non enim *meminimus maiores*) . . . me refeci.

*Imp. Pomp.* 47: *ut praeceperita meminisse videamur.*

*Plane.* 80: qui patriae *beneficia meminerunt.*

*Phil.* XI, 2: summi quondam inter ipsos *odium bellumque meministis.*

*Phil.* XII, 27: *memini conloquia.*

*De Re Pub.* VI, 10: non *facta solum, sed etiam dicta meminisset.*

*Aead.* II, 106: *omnia meminit Siron Epicuri dogmata.*

*Lael.* 71: *quae (officia) meminisse debet is, in quem, etc.*

*De Re Pub.* IV, 1: ipsa mens ea, quae futura videt, *praeterita meminit.*

*De Fin.* I, 57: ut . . . secunda jueunde ac suaviter *meminerimus.*

*Acad.* II, 106: *meminisse visa nisi compresa non possumus.*

*De Fin.* I, 60: *Bona praeterita non meminerunt.*

*De Fin.* II, 104: *mala meminisse non oportere.*

*De Fin.* I, 62: (sapiens) et *praeterita grata meminit et praesentibus ita potitur, ut . . .*

*Cato,* 21: *vadimonia constituta (senes meminerunt), quis sibi, cui ipsi debeant.*

*Brut.* 88, 301: *Hoc adjumento ille tanto sic ptebatur, ut sua et commentata et scripta et nullo referente omnia adversariorum dicta meminisset.*

*Ad Fam.* X, 12, 1: *Quod mili quidem minime novum, qui et te nossem et tuarum litterarum ad me missarum *promissa meminissem* et haberem tua penitus consilia cognita.*

*De Orat.* II, 355: *multa ab aliis audita meminerunt.*

*De Orat.* II, 299: *ut omnia meminisset.*

*De Orat.* II, 227: . . . *faceta autem et urbana innumerabilia vel ex una contione meministis.*

*Ad Fam.* X, 34, a, 3: *memini enim et illa superiora.*

Other neuter expressions in the accusative with *memini*:

*Multa,* *Phil.* IV, 3: *Tuse.* 1, 22; *ibid.* 59; *Cato,* 22, *Lael.* 2.

*Cato,* 21: *Omnia.*

*De Div.*, II, 65: *Utrum.*

Nenter Pronouns in the Merguet Lexicons	12
Not included in Merguet Lexicons-----	14
Total-----	26

### Obliviscor.

With the Genitive: (I) person; (II) thing.

#### I.

*Tuse.* V, 73: *huic (Epicuro) . . . non multum differenti a judicio ferarum *oblivisci* licebit *sui?**

*De Fin.* V, 3: *nec tanien Epicuri licet *oblivisci*, si cupiam.*

*Rab. Post.* 41: ut vel *oblivisci* (illum virum) *aliorum* non sit mirum.

*Phil. II,* 10: ne me . . . *oblitum esse* putetis *mei*.

*Ad Att. XI,* 21, 3: —ut *obliviscar* *mei* multoque malim.

*me meaque*, Koch's conj., B. This investigation points to *mei* as the proper reading.

*Ad Fam. VII,* 14, 1: Si *nostri oblitus es*, dabo operam, ut istuc veniam, antequam plane ex animo tuo effluo.

*Ad Fam. IX,* 12, 1: dum tu ades, *sunt oblita* *sui*.

*Ad Fam. XIII,* 19, 3: vereor ne . . ille . . putet . . . te *oblitum* *mei*.

## II.

*Sulla,* 45: quod si iam *essem oblitus severitatis et constantiae meae*.

*De Fin. IV,* 32: quae . . . natura suae primae *institutionis obliterata est*?

*Ad Fam. I,* 7, 7: non nos quidem ut nostrae *dignitatis simus oblitii*.

*Ad Fam. IX,* 10, 2: *Oblitus ne es igitur fungorum illorum?*

*Ad Fam. XI,* 27, 3: deinde *oblitum me putas consili, sermonis humanitatis tuae?*

*Ad Fam. XV,* 13, 2: ne aut ipse tuae perpetuae *consuetudinis erga me oblitus esse* videar aut te *oblitum putem*.

*Ad Fam. XI,* 27, 3: Nec vero sum *oblitus litterarum tuarum quas ad me misisti*.

*Ad Brut. I,* 15, 8: quod quis reprehendet, nisi qui deposito metu praeteriti *periculi fuerit oblitus?*

*Planc.* 101: neque inquam *obliviscar noctis illius*.

*Rab. Post.* 20: *obliviscerisne . . . accusationis tuae?*

*Cat. I,* 6: *obliviscere cedis atque incendiorum*.

*Verr. (Act. Pr.)* 52: quae (auctoritates) te *oblivisci laudis domesticae* non sinant.

*Rab. Post.* 46: si iam *oblivisci vestrae mansuetudinis volueritis*.

*Verr. III,* 186: nisi forte id egisti ut hominibus ne *oblivisci quidem rerum tuarum [male gestarum]* liceret.

*Q. Cic. De Petit ad M. Frat. 55* : . . . in hoc vel maxime est vitiosa civitas, quod largitione interposita *virtutis* ac *dignitatis* *oblivisci* solet.

*Ad Fam. III, 10, 5* : Illud vero mihi permirum accidit, tantam temeritatem fuisse in eo . . . ut tuis inimicitiis suscipiendis *oblivisceretur* prope omnium *fortunarum* ac *rationum* suarum.

*Tusc. III, 35* : jubes me bona cogitare, *oblivisci malorum*.

*Tusc. III, 37* : *obliviscor* etiam *malorum*, ut jubes.

*Tusc. III, 73* : est . . . proprium stultitiae aliorum vitia cernere, *oblivisci suorum*.

*De Fin. IV, 33* : quae (hominis natura) *oblivisceretur corporis*.

*Ad Fam. I, 9, 8* : num potui magis in areem illius causae invadere aut magis *oblivisci temporum* meorum, meminisse actionum?

With the Accusative, always of the thing.

*Sex. Rosc. 49* : et *artificium* *obliviscatur* et studium deponat licebit.

*Cael. 50* : *obliviscor* jam tuas *iniurias*.

*Milo, 63* : in quibus (civibus) homines . . . *res* *praeciarissimas* *obliviscuntur*.

*Scaur. 13* : *obliviscendum* vobis putatis . . . *scelera*?

NOTE. This passage is exceedingly doubtful. Many editors take it as quoted. I shall follow Mueller who changes the punctuation and avoids construing *scelera* with *obliviscendum*. I see no objection to doing this, while not to do it involves admitting a construction that is very rare if not unparalleled in Cicero. Cato, 2, 6 is sometimes quoted as parallel : *quam nobis quoque ingredendum sit*, but even here it is quite possible that the correct reading is *qua*, which occurs in one of the later manuscripts. Therefore the passage in question will not be included in any tables.

*Milo, 62* : an vero *obliti estis* . . . non modo inimicorum Milonis *sermones* et *opiniones* sed non nullorum etiam imperitorum.

*Brut. 217* : subito totam causam *oblitus est*.

*Ad Att. IX, 1* : Quod laudas, quia *oblivisci* me scripsi ante *facta* et *delicta* nostri amici.

*Ad Fam.* VIII, 15, 2 : Hui vereor . . . ne, cum te videro,  
omnia obliscear.

*Ligar.* 12, 35 : qui oblischi nihil soles nisi iniurias.

Other neutrals : *alia, Sex. Ros.* 87 ; *omnia, Phil.* VIII, 25.

Neuter Pronouns in the Merguet Lexicons-----	7
Not included in the Merguet Lexicons-----	2
	-
Total-----	9

### The Adjective Oblitus.

The following instances are given by Merguet under *obliviscor*. In my own investigation of texts I have made no complete record of such cases, merely noting that they almost always take the genitive. The rare instances where the accusative is used have been carefully recorded. In all the tables that follow, unless otherwise stated, statistics regarding *oblitus* are kept separate from statistics regarding other forms of *obliviscor*.

*Ad Att.* IV, 17, 1 : Puto te existimare me nunc *oblitum* consuetudinis et instituti mei rarius ad te scribere.

*Planc.* 103 : vos iam *oblitos* mei salutis eius . . . hostis exstisset.

*Cat.* IV, 19 : Habetis ducem memorem vestri, *oblitum* sui.

*Sulla*, 83 : adeo *oblitus* constantiae meae---?

*Sulla*, 46 : coges me *oblitum* nostrae amicitiae habere rationem etc.

*Phil.* I, 30 : cum omnes earum rerum *obliti* significarent.

*Phil.* II, 64 : una in illa re servitutis *oblita* civitas ingenuit.

*Phil.* I, 31 : cum . . . *oblitus* auspiciorum . . . voluisti.

*Murena*, 7 : me, familiaritatis necessitudinisque *oblitum*, causam . . . defendere.

*Cat.* IV, 1 : *obliti* salutis meae de vobis ac de vestris liberis cogitate.

*De Off.* I, 85 : ut utilitatem civium sic tueantur, ut, quaecunque agunt, ad eam referant *obliti* commodorum suorum.

*De Fin.* V, 57 : omnium ceterarum rerum *obliti*.

*De Nat.* I, 67 : *oblitus* liberalitatis meae . . . plura complector.

*Piso*, 62 : O paterni generis *oblite*!

*Ad Fam.* XVI, 12, 2 : Cum Caesar . . . *oblitus* nominis . . . Ariminium occupavisset.

### Recordor.

*Recordor* occurs in the works of Cicero 36 times with nouns or adjectives used substantively. It occurs 9 times with neuter pronouns, making a total of 45 appearances of this verb followed by a case. The case is always the accusative of the thing.

The three instances quoted by Draeger (*Historische Syntax*, 1878, I, p. 488 ff.) as instances of the genitive after *recordor*, two of which have been copied generally, even by recent scholars, have already been discussed. In the note to the quotation from Draeger in Part One of this thesis it has been shown that one of these supposed instances was due to a corrupt text, and that the other two were blunders in translation that have been handed down from generation to generation. *Superioris tuac transmissionis* (*ad Att.* IV, 19, 1) has gained such a firm foothold that it is quoted in the Harper's Dictionary as a genitive after *recordor*, while in the preceding column we are told that *δέππεις* (*ad Att.* IV, 17, 1) is an instance of an accusative after *recordor*, this being the "more frequent" construction. The interesting fact is that *δέππεις* is found in the text immediately after *transmissionis*, and that the passages quoted are one and the same, "19" being the later numbering.

The following passage is found in both Merguet and Harper listed as an accusative of the person with *recordor*: *cum recordor non L. Brutum, duos Decios, etc., etc.* *Cato*, 75.

Of this passage K. Meissner says in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1885, p. 219: "Eine ohue zweifel corrupt überlieferte Stelle." Whether this is true or not, the accusatives in question seem to be the subjects, either of the infinitive expressed, or of some infinitive understood, as *non timuisse mortem*. At any rate it is not a case in point and will not be considered further.

Merguet also cites, as a genitive of the person with *recordor*, *ut recordemini illius L. Metelli, pontificis maximi* (*pro Scaur.* 48), where *ut recordemini* is a conjecture to fill a lacuna (see Müller's text). The value of the conjecture may be judged from what has preceded. Cicero certainly used the genitive with *recordor* nowhere else.

This verb is rarely used when referring to persons. Cicero shows four or five instances followed by *de* and the ablative case. This construction occurs also, but infrequently, when a thing is referred to.

### Reminiscor.

I find *reminiscor* used with an object but twice in Cicero. Once (*ad Att.* IV, 2, 4, 2) the object is simply the abbreviation *Kal. Januar.*, and the case is therefore undeterminable. The other instance is as follows :

*Cato*, 78 : —ut eas (res pueri) non tum primum accipere videantur, sed *reminisci* et recordari.

The verb occurs also in *Ad Fam.* IV, 5, 5 with a neuter pronoun as object, but this letter was not written by Cicero, but by Servius to him.

### Commemini.

Cicero uses this verb three times. Once with an accusative of the person :

*De Orat.* I, 53, 227 : *quem hominem probe commeminisse* se aiebat.

Once with a neuter pronoun :

*Ad Att.* IX, 2, e : *hoc tu parum commeministi*.

Once with an accusative and infinitive (understood) :

*Tusc.* I, 6, 13 : *Ego antem non commemini*, ante quam sum natus, me miserum.

### With de and the Ablative.

The following are the only examples found of expressions of remembering and forgetting followed by *de* and the ablative case. It ought to be added, however, that no great care was taken to make the list complete.

*Cic. Leg. Agr.* II, 2, 3 : *de quibus (hominibus) meminisse* possumus.

*Cic. Phil.* II, 91 : *meministi ipse de exsilibus*.

NOTE. It is not certain that *de exsilibus* is to be taken with *meministi*. Mueller punctuates with a comma after the verb, taking it absolutely.

*Cic. ad Att.* XV, 27, 3 : *De Planco, memini*.

*Q. Cic. ad M. Frat. 56*: Haec veniebant mihi in mentem de duabus illis commentationibus matutinis.

Nepos in *ad Fam. V, 3*: De illo ne *meminisse* quidem volo.

*Cic. Pro Ligario, 35*: Spero te . . . aliquid de huius illo quaestorio officio etiam de aliis quibusdam quaestoribus *reminiscemtē recordari*.

*Cic. De Leg. Agr. II, 2, 3*: si *recordari* volueritis de novis hominibus.

*Cic. Pro Planco, 42, 104*: quoniam istis vestris lacrimis de illis *recordor*, quas pro me saepe et multum profudistis.

*Cic. Pro Sestio 1, 1*: Nam ut omittatis de unius cuiusque casu cogitando *recordari*.

### CAESAR.

**Memini.**

*B. C. 3, 108, 2*: eundem Achillam, *cuius supra meminimus*, omnibus copiis praefecit.

**Obliviscor.**

*B. G. 1, 14, 3*: quod si veteris *contumeliae* *oblivisci* vellet, num etiam recentium iniuriarum . . . memoriam deponere posse?

*B. G. 7, 34, 1*: cohortatus Haeduos, ut *controversiarum* ac *dissensionum* *obliviscerentur*.

**Recordor.**

*B. C. 3, 72, 4*: non denique communes belli *casus recordabantur*.

**Reminiscor.**

*B. G. 1, 13, 4*: Sin bello persecuti perseveraret, *reminisceretur* et veteris *incommodi* populi Romani et pristinae *virtutis* Helvetiorum.

**Oblitus.**

*B. C. 3, 57, 1*: non *oblitus* pristini *instituti*.

### CATULLUS.

**Obliviscor.**

LXVI, 26-7: Anne bonum *oblita's facinus*, quo regium adepta's conjugium?

**Memini.**

LXIV, 146-8 : Nil metunnt iurare, nihil promittere parcunt ;  
*dicta nihil meminere*, nihil periuria curant.

**LUCRETIUS.****Memini.**

III, 673 : Cur *super*a ante actam aetatem *meminisse* nequimus ?

IV, 710-13 : quin etiam gallum . . . noenu queunt rabidi contra  
constare leones inque tueri : ita continuo *meminere fugai*.

**SALLUST.****Memini.**

*B. Cat.* 51, 15 : sed plerique mortales *postrema meminere*.

**Oblitus.**

*B. Cat.* 51, 15 : *secleris eorum obliiti*.

**PUBLILIUS SYRUS.****Memini.**

*H.* 4 : Homo qui in homine calamitoso est misericors, *meminit*  
*sui*.

**Obliviscor.**

*L.* 14 : *Legem solet obliviouscier iracundia*.

**NEPOS.****Obliviscor.**

XVIII, 6, 2 : omnium *injuriarum* *oblivisceretur*, et in neminem  
acerbiore uteretur imperio.

**Reminiscor.**

XIX, 4, 1 : Cum alii, *reminiscentes* *veteris famae*, aetatis mise-  
rentur : plurimi, etc.

VII, 6 : Ille, lacrimans tales benevolentiam civium suorum  
accipiebat, *reminiscens* pristini acerbitatem.

XIV, 11, 3 : Datamen revocavit, simulans se quiddam in collo-  
quio esse oblitum.

**VIRGIL.<sup>1</sup>****Memini.**

With the Genitive : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

## I.

*Aen.* IV, 335 : nec me meminisse pigebit *Elissae* dum memor  
ipse mei.

## II.

*Geor.* III, 89–91 : talis Amyclaei domitus Pollucis habenis Cyl-  
larus et, *quorum* Grai meminere poetae, Martis equi biunges et  
magni currus Achillei. (*meminere* = *mentionem fecerunt*).

*Aen.* III, 202 : Ipse diem noctemque negat discernere caelo,  
nec meminisse viac media Palinurus in unda.

*Aen.* I, 731–3 : Juppiter, hospitibus nam te dare jura loquuntur,  
hunc laetum Tyriisque diem Troiaque profectis esse velis, nostros-  
que *huius meminisse* minores.

*Geor.* III, 216 : nec nemorum patitur meminisse neque herbae  
dulcibus illa quidem inlecebris.

*Aen.* XI, 280 : nec mihi enim Teucris nullum post eruta bellum  
Pergama, nec veteranum memini laetorve malorum.

This has been taken as a Grecism, and therefore is not includ-  
ed in any statistics.

With the Accusative : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

## I.

*Catalepton* IX (XI), 50 : Saepe etiam densos immittere corpus  
in hostes, communem belli non meminisse deum.

## II.

*Ec.* VII, 19 : *Alternos Musae meminisse* volebant.

*Ec.* IX, 45 :  *numeros memini*, si verba tenerem.

*Dirae*, 102 : *gaudia semper enim tua me meminisse* licebit.

*Culex*, 295 : *peccatum meminisse* tuom grave sede piorum.

*Ciris*, 139 ff. : Junonis magnae (cuius *periuria* divae olim se  
meminere, ut iam periura puellae non nulli liceat) violaverat  
inscia sedem.

---

<sup>1</sup> I include under this head the poems of the Pseudo-Virgilian canon.

(The passage is very corrupt. Among the conjectures for *sc* are *si*, *sic*, *sed*, *ipsae*, *dī*, *sat*. *Puellae*, *iam*, *periura* and *liccat* are also doubtful, but nevertheless the *periuria meminere* appears to be sound).

*Aen.* XI, 280: nec mihi cum Teucris ullam post eruta bellum Pergama, nec veteranū *memini* laetorve malorum.

*Ciris*, 119: *responsum quoniam satis est meminisse deortum.*

*Memini* is followed twice in Virgil by neuter pronoun. They are both accusatives.

#### Obliviscor.

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

##### I.

*Aen.* III, 629, *Centones* (*P. L. M.* 4, 197, 11; 220, 17): *Oblitusve sui est.*

*Centones* (*P. L. M.* 4, 220, 16): et *oblitus est famae melioris amantis.*

With the Accusative.

*Aen.* II, 148: *Quisquis es, amissos hinc iam obliviscere Graios.* Quoted on a Pompeian wall inscription, *C. I. L.* IV, 1841.

*Geor.* II, 59: *pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores.* Note that the participle here takes the accusative.

#### Oblitus.

*Aen.* IX, 225: *laxabant curas et corda oblita laborum.*

*Aen.* IV, 528: *lenibant curas et corda oblita laborum.*

*Carmen Verg.* (*P. L. M.* IV, p. 213, l. 145); *Fatorum oblitus.*

*Geor.* III, 245: *catulorum oblita leaena.*

*Aen.* IV, 221: *oblitos famae melioris amantis.*

*Aen.* IV, 267: *heu regni rerumque oblite tuarum?*

#### Reminiscor.

*Aen.* X, 782: *dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos.*

#### Recordor.

*Aen.* VIII, 156: *ut verba parentis et vocem Anchisae magni volvumque recordor!*

*Aen.* III, 107: *si rite audita recordor.*

**LIVY.****Memini.**

With the Genitive : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

## I.

IV, 35, 6 : Aut *sui* aut *suorum* meminisset.

XXIV, 6, 8 : inflatus adsentationibus eorum, qui enim non Hieronis tantum, sed Pyrrhi etiam regis, materni avi, iubebant meminisse.

## II.

VI, 27, 7 : plebem nec respirare in urbe aut per otium *libertatis* meminisse sinant aut consistere in contione.

III, 61, 12 : iam Horatius eos . . . adsuefecerat sibi potius fidere quam meminisse ignominiae decemvirorum ductu acceptae.

V, 54, 3 : fateor vobis, etsi minus iniuriae vestrae quam meae calamitatis meminisse iuvat.

V, 30, 2 : si *suae gloriae* sibi inter dimicationem patriae meminisse sit fas.

X, 29, 2 : Galli . . . torpere quidam et nec *pugnae* meminisse nec *fugae*.

XXX, 22, 6 : *cuius* (pacis) ipsi non meminissent.

XXX, 31, 6 : quod ad me attinet, et humanae *infirmitatis* memini.

XXXVI, 44, 9 : Livius . . . remiges . . . iussit . . . in advenientis hostium naves ferreas manus incire, et ubi pugnam pedestri similem fecissent, meminisse *Romanae virtutis*.

XXXVI, 29, 10 : et Nicandrum privatim *eius diei*, quo servatus a se foret, meminisse.

X, 37, 8 : "non ita," inquit, "patres conscripti, vestrae *maiestatis* meminero, ut me consulem esse obliviscar."

XLV, 8, 4 : nunc vero, cum et . . . et *pacis* postea, quam cum summa fide adversus eum coluimus, meminisses.

XLV, 42, 8 : responsum . . . est populum Romanum meminisse amicitiae.

III, 40, 3 : C. Claudi . . . oratio . . . orantis . . . ut civilis potius *societatis*, in qua natus esset, quam *foederis* nefarie icti cum collegis meminisset.

XXVI, 22, 7: iuberet . . . meminisse in consulibus creandis belli, quod in Italia sit, temporumque rei publicae.

XLI, 3, 4: cetera . . . praeda vere futura, si belli hostes meminissent.

XLI, 22, 7: peteūs, ne diutius *simultatum*, quae cum patre suo fuissent, meminissent.

With the Accusative.

XXVIII, 26, 14: *qualem* [vultum] ne in acie quidem aiebant meminisse.

V, 44, 3: *quanta* (beneficia) ipsi meministis.

**Obliviscor.**

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

X, 26, 2: ceterum si sibi adiutorem belli sociumque imperii darent, quonam modo se *oblivisci* *P. Decii* consulis per tot collegia experti posse?

VII, 14, 2: ne . . . se . . . *sui oblitum* . . . crederet (see ex. 4 under II).

XL, 21, 5: si perget tamen ire, non posse *oblivisci* se in talibus rebus *Antigoni*.

XXX, 30, 16: ut omnium *obliviscaris aliorum*, satis ego documenti in omnes casus sum.

II.

There are in Livy three instances of *obliviscor* in the second periphrastic conjugation. Two of them are with the dative of the agent and the genitive of the thing to be forgotten. In the third example, the thing to be forgotten is used as the subject. This example is therefore not at all in point, but it will be included.

VIII, 7, 16: ut aut *rer. publicae* mili aut mei meorumque *obliviscendum sit*.

XLV, 4, 6: Sensit Perseus cuius *nominis* *obliviscendum* victo esset.

XXIII, 22, 9: [id omnium maxime tegendum, oculendum, *obliviscendum*, pro non dicto habendum esse.]

VII, 14, 2: Tullius magno opere a dictatore petere, ne se *oblitum disciplinae militaris*, ne sui neve imperatoriae *maiestatis* crederet.

XXXIV, 22, E: etiamsi nostrarum *oblivisceremur iniuriarum*.

XXXII, 21, 23: nostrorum ipsi *vulnerum*, si vultis, *obliviscamur*.

XXVI, 49, 15: quae ne in malis quidem *oblita decoris* matronalis *estis*?

V, 5, 8: Quid? *periculi*, quod differendo bello adimus, num *oblivisci* nos haec tam cerebra Etruriae concilia de mittendis Veios auxiliis patiuntur.  
Neuter Pronoun.

XXVIII, 29, 6: utinam tam facile vos *obliviscamini eorum* quam ego *obliviscar*. ('*eorum*' refers to *ea*, *quae fecisti* in previous sentence.)

With the Accusative.

II, 38, 2: "veteres populi Romani *iniurias cladesque gentis Volscorum*, ut omnia" inquit "*obliviscamini alia*".

### Oblitus.

*Oblitus*, the adjective or participle, occurs twenty-two times in Livy. Twenty-one times it is followed by the genitive. The only accusative is a neuter pronoun: *veluti aliquid oblitus*. XXII, 58, 8.

### Reminiscor.

*Reminiscor* does not occur in Livy with an object.

### Recordor.

VI, 20, 15: *populum brevi*, postquam *periculum ab eo nullum erat*, per se ipsas *recordantem* virtutes desiderium eius tenuit.

## HORACE.

### Memini.

*Eph.* I, 3, 12: Ut valet? ut *meminit nostri*?

*Sat.* II, 6, 36-7: De re communi scribae *magna atque nova te* Orabant hodie *meminisses*, Quinte, reverti.

**Obliviscor.**

*Epd. 2, 37-8 :* Quis non malarum, quas amor curas habet,  
Inter haec *obliviseitur*?

**Oblitus.**

The adjective *oblitus* occurs three times in Horace followed by a case, always the genitive.

**Neuter Pronouns.**

There are two neuter pronouns in Horace used as objects of these verbs,—both accusatives, one after *recordor*, and one after *memini*.

**TIBULLUS.**

There is in Tibullus only one example. That is a neuter pronoun with *memini*.

**PROPERTIUS.****Memini.**

With the Genitive of the Thing.

III, 13, 28 : Possum ego naturae non meminisse tuae.

IV, 19, 1 : Credis enim iam posse tuae *meminisse figurae*.

With the Accusative : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

**I.**

I, 11, 16 : communes nec *meminisse deos*.

**II.**

I, 10, 3 : O noctem *meminisse* mihi iucunda voluptas.

III, 5, 23 : *memento* hoc iter.

Other verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting* are not represented in Propertius.

**OID.****Memini.**

With the Genitive : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

**I.**

*Tr.* III, 10, 1 : Siquis adhuc istic *meminit Nasonis* adempti.

*Ex Pont.* IV, 6, 50: (Solis) quam quisquam vestrum, qui me doluisti ademptum, arguat ingratum non *meminisse sui*.

*Tr.* V, 13, 18: di faciant, ut sit temeraria nostra querela, teque putem falso non *meminisse mei*!

*Ex Pont.* II, 4, 6: non ita di mihi sunt tristes, ut credere possim fasque putem iam te non *meminisse mei*.

*Ex Pont.* II, 11, 4: ut—scire tamen possis nos *meminisse tui*.

*Ex Pont.* III, 6, 11: non vetat ille sui quemquam *meminisse sodalis*.

## II.

*Metam.* IX, 291: Quin nunc quoque frigidus artus. Dum loquor, horror habet, parsque est *meminisse doloris*.

*Ex Pont.* IV, 4, 10: possim *fortunae* nec *meminisse meae*.

*Tr.* IV, 4, 40: A! sine me *fati* non *meminisse mei*!

*Metam.* VII, 797: iuvat a *meminisse* beati *temporis*, Aeacida.

*Metam.* XII, 542: . . . quid me *meminisse malorum* cogis.

*Metam.* XIII, 280: me misertum, quanto cogor *meminisse dolor temporis illius*.

*Metam.* XV, 774: . . . quid nunc antiqua recordor dama mei generis? timor hic *meminisse priorum* non sinit.

With the Accusative: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

### I.

*Metam.* III, 444: *Equam*, cum vestrae tot agantur saecula vitae qui sic tabuerit, longo *meministis* in aevo?

### II.

*Heroides* 15, 43: *meminerunt omnia amantes*.

*Metam.* XII, 459: . . . *vulnera non memini*, numerum nomenque notavi.

*Metam.* XII, 182–5: Tum senior: quamvis obstet mihi tarda vetustas multaque me fugiant primis spectata sub annis, *plura* tamen *memini*.

### Neuter Pronouns.

Ovid uses neuter pronouns in the accusative after *memini* three times.

**Obliviscor.**

With the Genitive : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

## I.

*Tr.* IV, 3, 24 : et *oblitam* [te] non sinit esse mei.

*Ex Pont.* IV, 1, 18 : *oblitus* potero non tamen esse tui.

## II.

*Ex Pont.* II, 10, 7 : sis licet *oblitus* pariter *gemmaeque manusque*.

**Oblitus.**

There are sixteen instances in Ovid of *oblitus* governing a case. It is always the genitive.

**Recordor.**

*Recordor*, governing a case, occurs but three times in Ovid. The case is always the accusative, of the thing.

**Reminiscor.**

*Ex Pont.* I, 8, 31 : Nam modo vos animo dulces reminiscor amici.

*Tr.* V, 4, 31 : Saepe etiam maerens tempus reminiscitur illud.

**SENECA RHETOR.****Memini.**

With the Genitive of the Person.

*Contr.* IX, 29, 3 : dum matris meminit, obliviousetur nevercae. at illa dum nevercae meminit, matris oblita est.

With the Accusative of the Person.

*Excerpt. Contr.* I, VII, 24 : Sparsum memini hominem inter scholasticos sanum, inter sanos scholasticum.

With the Accusative of the Thing.

*Suasoriae* 5, 1 : Omnis destituit animum dies ubi ignominia spem premit, ubi nullam meminit aciem nisi qua fugerit.

**Neuter Pronouns.**

There are also in Seneca Rhetor two neuter pronouns in the accusative after *memini*.

**Obliviscor.**

With the Genitive of the Person.

*Contr. IX*, 29, 3 : dum matris meminit, *obliviscetur novercae*, at illa dum novercae meninit, *matris oblitæ est*.

*Contr. VII*, 20, 5 : The second periphrastic, followed by genitive : Si rerum natura pateretur, *obliviscendum erat mihi patris* dam occiderem.

**Oblitus.**

*Oblitus* occurs three times in Seneca Rhetor with the genitive.

**PSEUDO-CAESAR.****Obliviscor.**

With the Genitive of the Thing.

*Bell. Alex. VIII*, 6 : Proinde eius *consili* *obliviscerentur* atque omni ratione esse vincendum cogitarent.

**Oblitus.**

There is one instance of *oblitus* with genitive.

**MANILIUS.****Memini.**

*Astronomica*, IV, 330 : At Leo *consortis* *meminit* sub lege trigoni.

**Oblitus.**

*Oblita sui* occurs once in Manilius.

## SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMPLES.

The following collection of examples was made with the aid of various indexes. For completeness it depends upon the accuracy of these indexes. The examples as far as given, however, have been verified by standard texts.

### CELSUS.

Memini.

III, 16 : si febris quievit, diu *meminisse* eius *dici* convenit.

III, 18 : (neuter pronoun) *si qua meminerunt.*

### QUINTILIAN.

Memini.

XI, 3, 151 : ut vix unquam ita sollicitari partibus earum debeamus, ut non et *summae meminerimus.*

XI, 2, 16 : (= mentionem facere) neque omnino *huius rei meminit usquam* poeta ipse, profecto non tacitus de tanta sua gloria.

XI, 2, 20 : (neuter pronoun) Ita, quamlibet multa sint, *quorum meminisse* oporteat.

### Obliviscor.

XI, 1, 62 : ne *oblivisceretur reverentiae.*

### Oblitus.

IX, 2, 86 : *obliti tot exemplorum circa voluntariam mortem.*

### Recordor.

XI, 2, 6 : hesternorum immemores acta pueritiae *recordari.*

### PSEUDO-QUINTILIAN.

Memini.

*Decl.* CCXCVII, p. 175, l. 8, (Ritter) : *meminit temporum superiorum.*

*ibid.* : *meminit illarum . . . . voluptatum.*

*ibid.* : *meminit amoris tui.*

*ibid.* CCCXXXVIII, p. 331, l. 3 : (neuter prounoun) *meminerit eorum*, quae audierit.

### Obliviscor.

*ibid.* CCXCI, p. 161, l. 22 : *oblivisci conjugii.*

### SENECA.

#### Oblitus.

*de Ira* III, 12, 6 (p. 90, Haase) : *Oblitus jam servi.*

*ibid.* I, 1, 2 (p. 35, Haase) : *decoris oblita.*

### PETRONIUS.

#### Memini.

With the Genitive of the Person.

117 : ut facile appareret dominum etiam *corum meminisse*, qui praesentes non essent.

43 and 75 : *vivorum meminerimus.*

With the Accusative : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

I.

44 : [sed] *memini* Safinium.

II.

91 : nihil iam queror, nihil iam *memini*.

### Obliviscor.

110 : quam cito etiam *filiorum obliviscerentur.*

125 : prioris fortunae *esset oblitus statum.*

66 : ut frequenter *nomen meum oblizscar.*

### Neuter Pronouns.

Petronius uses neuter pronouns in the accusative once with *memini* and once with *obliviscor*.

#### Oblitus.

*Oblitus* occurs seven times, followed always by the genitive.

**PLINY.****Oblitus.**

*N. H.*, VIII, VII, 7, 21 : *oblitus imperatoris.*

**MARTIAL.****Memini.**

IV, 88, 8 : Dicere te posses ut *meminisse mei*?

X, 23, 6 : Nulla recordanti lux est ingrata gravisque ; nulla fuit, *cuius non meminisse velit.*

II, 59, 4 : Ipse iubet *mortis* te *meminisse* deus.

**Recordor.**

X, 23, 5 : Nulla *recordanti* lux est ingrata gravisque.

**Oblitus.**

*Oblitus* occurs once, followed by the genitive.

**TACITUS.****Memini.**

With the Genitive : (I) of the Person ; (II) of the Thing.

## I.

*Ann.* III, 4, 6 : concidisse rem publicam . . . . claimitabant, promptius apertiusque, quam ut *meminisse imperitantium* crederes.

*Ann.* IV, 35, 11 : nec deerunt, si damnatio ingruit, qui non modo *Cassii et Bruti*, sed etiam *mei meminerint.*

*Ann.* XI, 6, 10 : *meminissent Asinii, Messallae, ac recentiorum Arruntii et Aesernini.*

*Ann.* XIV, 63, 5 : *Meminerant adhuc quidam Agrippinae.*

*Ann.* VI, 37, 22 : *Vitellins . . . monet Tiridatem . . . , Phraatis avi et altoris Caesaris quaque utrobique pulchra meminerit.*

## II.

*Dial. de Or.* 37, 31 : *quaestionis meminerimus sciamusque nos de ea re loqui, quae, etc.*

*Hist.* III, 4, 5 : *Flavianus . . . suspiciones militum irritabat, tamquam adfinitatis cum Vitellio meminisset.*

*Ann.* II, 15, 10: *meminissent modo avaritiae, crudelitatis, superbiae* (sc. Romanorum).

*Hist.* IV, 8, 9: *se meminisse temporum, quibus natus sit, quam civitatis formam patres avique instituerint.*

*Hist.* IV, 72, 23: *priorum facinorum neque imperatorem neque se meminisse.*

*Ann.* II, 45, 18: *meminissent modo tot proeliorum.*

*Ann.* III, 34, 25: *sic obviam irent eis, quae alibi peccarentur, ut flagitiorum urbis meminissent.*

#### Neuter Pronomii.

*Ann.* II, 26, 8: *corum quoque meminisset* (Germanicus) *quae venti et fluctus . . . saeva damina intulissent.*

#### With the Accusative of the Person.

*Ann.* VI, 27, 4: (Blandus) *enius avum Tiburtem equitem Romanum plerique meminerant* (note the predicate relation).

#### With the Accusative of the Thing.

*Ann.* XV, 41, 9: *ut . . . multa seniores meminerint, quae reparari nequibant.*

#### Obliviscor.

#### With the Genitive of the Thing.

*Hist.* II, 67, 10: *numquam ita ad curas intento Vitellio, ut voluptatum oblivisceretur.*

*Hist.* II, 1, 21: *obliviseendum (esse) offendarum de bello agitantibus.*

#### Oblitus.

Tacitus furnishes also nine instances of *oblitus*, followed always by the genitive.

#### Recordor.

This verb, followed by an object, is found three times in Tacitus, the object being each time in the accusative and referring to things.

#### Reminiscor.

*Ann.* XI, 36, 2: *reminisceretur vocis.*

**PLINY THE YOUNGER.****Memini.***Ep. I, 5, 13: huius iudicij meministi.***Obliviscor.***ibid.: illius oblitus es.***SUETONIUS.****Memini.***Caes. 9: meminerunt huius coniurationis.***Recordor.**There are two instances of *recordor* with the accusative.**Reminiscor.***Cl. 41: temperare non potuit quin ex intervallo subinde facti reminisceretur.***JUSTIN.****Oblitus.***XII, 15, 9 (Rühl, p. 101, l. 9): oblitus necessitudinum.*

---

**TABLES.**

---

The following tables contain complete statistics for the foregoing examples:

The + sign prefixed to a number indicates that the number refers to neuter pronouns.

Roman numerals indicate passages in which *oblitus* governs a case.

EARLY LATIN.

	ACCUSATIVE.	GENITIVE.				
	<i>Memini.</i>	<i>Obliviscor.</i>	<i>Reminiscor.</i>	<i>Mennisi.</i>	<i>Oblitisciur.</i>	<i>Reminiscor.</i>
Person.	Thing.	Person. Thing.	Person Thing	Person. Thing	Person. Thing	Person. Thing.
Juvius Andronicus	2	13 + 13	1	4 + 1	2	2
Plautius	0 + 3	-	-	1	2	2 + 1
Terence	-	-	-	-	-	1
Appius Claudius	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sextius Turpilius	1	-	-	-	-	-
Caecilius Statius	-	-	1	-	-	-
Aecinus	-	-	2	0 + 1, I	-	-
Cato	-	-	1	-	-	-
Cl. Quadrigerius	-	-	1	-	-	-
Ad Herennium	6 + 3	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS.....	2	22 + 19	3	5 + 2, I	0	2
					4	4 + 1
					2	1
					1	0
					0	0

CICERONIAN AGE.

	ACCUSATIVE		GENITIVE.	
	<i>Mennini.</i>	<i>Oblivisor.</i>	<i>Reminiscor.</i>	<i>Mennini.</i>
				Person. Thing. Person. Thing. Person. Thing.
Ciceron	14	41 + 26	10 + 9	4
Servius (ad Fam. IV, 5, 5)			0 + 1	7
Caesar				8, III 21, XII
Dee. Laberius				2, I
Varro	2			1
Catullus	1			
Incretius	1 + 1			
Sallust	1			
Publili. Syrus		1		
Nepos		0 + 1		
			2 + 1	8
	16 + 27	0	12 + 10	8
				9, III 24, XIV
				0
				2

AUGUSTAN AGE—AND LATER.

	<i>Menni.</i>	<i>Oblivior.</i>	<i>Reminiscor.</i>	<i>Menni.</i>	<i>Oblivior.</i>	<i>Reminiscor.</i>
	Person.	Thing.	Person.	Thing.	Person.	Thing.
Virgil	1	7+2	1	1	1	VI
Juv.	2		1, I		2	4, I
Horace	I+1				1	8+I, XXI
Tribullus	0+1				1	III
Propertius	1				2	
Dvid	1	3+3	1	1	6	2
Seneca Rhetor	1	1+2			2	XVI
Pseudo-Caesar					3	III
Manilius					1	1
<b>TOTAL.</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16+9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1, II</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10, II</b>
Celsus					13	12+1, L
Quintilian					29	o
Sseudo-Quintilian						o
Seneca	1	1+1			3+1	1
Petronius	1				1	VII
Pliny					1	
Marital					2	IX
Facetus	1	1			7+1	2,
Pliny the Younger					1	I
Suetonius					1	I
Institut.						1
	2	2+2	0	2+1	9	17+3
					1, II	5, XX
						o
						2

## PART III.

### DETERMINATION OF USAGE AND MEANING.

#### I.

##### CRITICAL.

###### A.

We have now before us all the instances occurring in extant Latinity down to the end of the Augustan period where a verb of *remembering* or *forgetting* is followed by a case, and may now proceed to examine the statements made by various scholars regarding the usage.

Reserving criticism of Nonius, Caper, and the other ancient authorities until later, let us look at once at the modern theories. In Part One it was stated that these might be grouped, for convenience of examination, in three general classes. First, those that assert that the genitive when used after verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting* is the so-called partitive genitive; secondly, those that regard this genitive as due to the substantive idea inhering in the verb; thirdly, those that attempt to explain it on the basis of some other special difference of signification. Karl Reisig and P. Clairin were quoted in support of the first theory. In the one case the writer supports his position by arguments that are abstruse and by illustrations that are not in point. In the other case the theory is put forward, rather dubiously, in the form of a question, and there is but little attempt at supporting it. When one talks of "forgetting the impression of a thing where you still know the fact" and of an "intentional disappearance from the memory", it is difficult to know precisely what is meant. When one further explains by saying "now, you cannot forget insults, but you may very well destroy the impressions, therefore you say *iniuriarum obliisci*", the meaning becomes clearer, though it is at the expense of the theory it would sup-

port, for such passages as *obliviscor iam tuas iniurias* (Cic. *pro Cael.* 50) may then be quoted. These tend materially to increase our scepticism regarding the credibility of the theory, which is subjective in the extreme. This is very evident from the fact that passages cited by one scholar in support of one view are cited by others in support of the opposite view. For example take *Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe meministi* (Cic. *de Orat.* III, 50, 194). Reisig says that this goes to prove that the accusative is used with *memini* when referring to persons, only when one is thinking of the object in general without knowing the personality, whereas with the genitive it is presupposed that you have known the person. On the other hand Clairin, supporting the same theory (*i. e.*, that the genitive denotes that the "memory is not the object, but only part of it")<sup>1</sup> says: "In support of this is the fact that the same verbs take an object in the accusative in the sense of 'to know'". Then he quotes *Antipater ille Sidonius quem tu probe meministi!*

Furthermore, Landgraf, in editing Reisig, insists that Reisig's examples go to prove just the opposite of what he asserts they prove, and show that *memini* with the accusative of the person is used when you have in mind one who has lived in your time or whom you yourself have known. My own feeling for the passages is that they prove neither the one thing nor the other. Let us examine the instances in Cicero, for example, where the name of a person is used as the object of *memini*. There are twelve of them and they are all in the accusative. (See Part Two, under Cicero, p. 22 f.) Generally the person referred to was living in the time of the individual to whom the act of remebering is ascribed. It is difficult, if not impossible, to decide whether or not the two were acquainted. That they were not, might at first seem probable from such passages as *Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem* (Cic. *Phil.* V, 17), because of the contrast between *memini* and *vidi*. But we have also *memineram Paulum, videram Galum* (Cic. *Lael.* 9). Now it is Laelius him-

<sup>1</sup>This is the form of statement used by Clairin. Reisig's is "With the genitive one thinks of a part of the whole".

self who is represented as speaking here, and Paulus was the father of Scipio Africanus Minor, whose intimacy with Laelius is so well known. It is hardly possible that Cicero meant to represent Laelius as "thinking of the object in general, without knowing the person". Nor is this the sort of process, it seems to me, that is referred to in such a passage as *L. Thorius Balbus fuit, Lanuvinus, quem meminisse non potes* (Cic. *De Fin.* II, 63). In fact, if we consider only these twelve passages from Cicero we must admit that they seem to support the contention of Landgraf, that *memini* with the accusative of the person is used only when you have in mind one who has lived in your time or whom you yourself have known. Furthermore, it must be stated that these passages are the only ones, down to the death of Cicero, in which the name of a person, or a relative pronoun referring to the name of a person, is used as the object of a verb of *remembering* or *forgetting*. *Eundem Achillam, cuius supra meminimus, omnibus copiis praefecit* (Caes. *B. C.* III, 108, 2) is not a case in point, for the *meminimus* has the unusual sense of *mentionem fecisse*.

But when we go on into the Augustan period we find a different state of things. There, names of persons occur four times after *memini*. Three times the case used is the genitive. In one of them certainly, and in the other two quite probably, the subject knew personally the object. The passages are as follows:

Virg. *Aen.* IV, 335: *nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae dum memor ipse mei.*

Livy, XXIV, 6, 8: *inflatus adsentationibus eorum, qui eum non Hieronis tantum, sed Pyrrhi etiam regis, materni avi, jubebant meminisse.*

Ovid, *Tr.* III, 10, 1: *Siquis adhuc istic meminit Nasonis adempti.*

Passing on to the next period we find Tacitus using only the genitive in such instances. There are four of them. Here again it is difficult to know whether or not personal recollection is meant. In the following passage apparently it is. Tac. *Ann.* XIV, 63, 5: *At Nero . . . insula Pandateria Octaviam claudit, non alia exul visentium oculos maiore misericordia adfecit. Meminerant adhuc quidam Agrippinae a Tiberio . . . pulsae.*

So much for the names of persons. In the case of other references to persons, the genitive is the case almost exclusively used, and we find *generi, sodalis, matris, novercae, consortis, etc.*, where it is idle to deny the existence of personal acquaintance. This would be in support of Reisig's position, as would also the fact that *memini* always takes the genitive of a personal or reflexive pronoun. Thus we see the testimony of the passages in point supporting now Reisig and now his critics in such a way as to demonstrate amply the untenable nature of the theories of either party. A complete statement of the results of the present investigation will be deferred until after the examination and criticism of the rest of Part One.

## B.

In general the scholars whom I have included in the second class, *i. e.*, those who feel that the genitive is due to a substantive idea inhering in the verb, are conservative. They put forward their theory as probable rather than as fully proved. They do not attempt to formulate rules but are inclined to admit with Draeger, for example, that "the language was always unsettled in these expressions and often the accusative is used in place of the genitive." They also follow Draeger when he says, "In classical Latin and later the genitive is everywhere the more common and appears even with neuter pronouns if their neuter origin is evident from the context." We shall find little reason to dispute these statements of fact. As for the theory, it will be neglected for the present. A bare statement of a theory based on incomplete data is an exceedingly intangible thing. It is difficult either to combat or to support it. Like most guesses at truth, it may contain the essence of verity or may be wholly wrong. To be sure we have now in our possession fairly complete data regarding the subject under consideration. I shall nevertheless continue for the present to confine myself to criticism of the statements of fact made by the various scholars and to criticism of interpretation wherever that is possible. This will be followed by a statement of facts gleaned in the present investigation. Then

if it is possible to characterize any theory as proved, or not proved, or incapable of proof, I shall do so.

In general we have found the champions of the inhering substantive idea to be conservative. Friederick Haase (see Part One) makes, however, the following positive statements: "The verbs *reminisci*, *oblivisci*, *recordari*, *meminisse* take the genitive or the accusative with a distinction which results naturally from the character of the case. . . . In such cases the object has its own fixed meaning and that is not at all identical with the signification of the genitive." Here we have something tangible and we may say at once that the statement, as applying to *recordor* at least, is not true, for the simple reason that *recordor* never takes the genitive, as has already been shown. Regarding the other verbs a detailed examination is necessary. Haase begins with a consideration of instances in which the object is a person, and explains the "fixed meaning" to which he referred, by citing Cic. *Phil.* V, 6, 17, *Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem.*

"The connection with *vidi*" says Haase "shows that here he would refer to mental activity only, and nothing more. On the other hand, had he said *Cinnae memini*, more would be involved. Then his ability to remember would be so circumscribed owing to Cinna, that he could not forget him . . . , under such circumstances his memory is limited and determined by the nature of the situation, and is not a free activity, by virtue of which he may call to mind Cinna if he wish, or may refrain from doing so if he wish that. Of persons this accusative is rare, the genitive frequent."

This concluding statement will not bear investigation. Exclusive of personal and reflexive pronouns, which are practically always in the genitive, I have found fifty passages where references to persons follow these verbs. In twenty-six instances the case used is the genitive; in twenty-four it is the accusative.

Before turning to a consideration of the passage cited in support of the rest of the statement I wish to admit frankly that when one speaks of *voluntarily refraining from remembering*, one raises a psychological question that is altogether too subtle for

me. And furthermore I cannot but regard a position that depends for its support upon such subtleties as, *ipso facto*, weak. However, reduced to its simplest terms, Reisig's statement seems to be that *Cinnam memini* refers to a voluntary act, *Cinnae memini* to an involuntary one. Grant that this is true, and consider what is to be expected in some such sentence as "They bade him remember the king" or "Let them remember Caesar." Now surely it would be foolish to order people to get in a frame of mind that did not depend upon their own volition. One therefore naturally expects the accusative, for the genitive would mean that the king, for example "had so impressed himself upon the mind of the individual in question" that his memory . . . is not a free activity, by virtue of which he may call to mind the king if he wish or may refrain from doing so if he wish that. Yet Livy says (XXIV, 6, 8) *inflatus adsentationibus eorum qui eum non Hieronis tantum, sed Pyrrhi etiam regis, materni avi, jubeant meminisse*; and Tacitus (*Ann.* XI, 6, 10) *Meminissent Asinii, Messallae, ac recentiorum Arruntii et Aesernini.*

Haase does not attempt to support his position by citing any instances where the object of *memini* is a thing. This he might easily have done. He had only to say "The accusative points to a voluntary act. Here we have a voluntary act, and hence the accusative." It is also true that it would be quite as easy to support with such argument exactly the opposite proposition, *viz.*: that the genitive refers to a voluntary act. In either case the statement would be arbitrary and the proof would be the 'vicious circle'. On the other hand it seems to me that the most arbitrary would hesitate before insisting that such a distinction existed between the following :

(animus) *meminit praeteritorum, praesentia cernit, futura providet.* (Cic. *De Div.* I, 63); *Ipsa mens ea, quae futura videt, praeterita meminit.* (Cic. *De Re Pub.* IV, 1.)

Turning now to *obliviscor*, let me again register my objection to such expressions as "voluntary forgetfulness." Granting however the possibility of any such conception, I maintain that we ought to have the accusative instead of the genitive in such

passages as *iubes me bona cogitare, oblivisci malorum*, (Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* III, 35); *obliviscere etiam malorum, ut iubes* (*ibid.* 37); *obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum* (*id. Cat.* I, 6); *Proinde eius consilii obliviscerentur atque omni ratione esse vincendum cogitarent* (*Bell. Alex.* VIII, 6); *est . . . proprium stultiae aliorum vitia cernere, oblivisci suorum* (Cic. *Tusc.*, III, 73). How can "*oblivisci suorum*" be "*proprium stultiae*" if Haase is right? Can one justly be held accountable for acts that one is powerless to prevent?

Again, how would Haase explain "*veteres populi Romani iniurias cladesque gentis Volscorum, ut omnia*" *inquit* "*obliviscamini alia*" (Livy, II, 38, 2)? In explaining *veteris contumeliae oblivisci vellet* (Caes. *B. G.* I, 14,) it will be remembered that he says "A man naturally and as a matter of duty is mindful of an insult offered his people. It is a grievance which one carries in his heart whether or no, the memory of which is thus involuntary." The concessive subjunctive in the passage from Livy is precisely parallel, it seems to me, with the passage from Caesar.

In short Haase's treatment of the subject would seem to be open to criticism, first as being inaccurate in statements of fact, as for example the statements regarding *recordor*, and regarding the relative infrequency of the accusative of the person with these verbs, secondly as depending for its support on a subtle if not impossible distinction, and thirdly since, granting the correctness of the distinction, it can be supported only by the most arbitrary interpretation of our literary monuments; moreover it meets with inconsistencies that seem impossible of explanation. In spite of these errors of treatment, due to a lack of material, it is probable that the theory championed by Haase and the others grouped with him is more nearly correct than any other yet advanced. This, it will be remembered is the theory of an inhering substantive idea, as the reason for the use of the genitive.

### C.

The scholars whom I have grouped in class three confine themselves to a simple assertion of the difference in meaning between the genitive and the accusative when used as the object of verbs

of *remembering* and *forgetting*. They do not attempt to account for this difference. The summary of results of this investigation will offer sufficient criticism on most of these. Many of them are well along on the right road. Two statements, however, demand special attention. They are those of J. B. Greenough and J. W. Donaldson. They are placed side by side because they are directly opposed. Each would insist that it is the idea of a single act and continued action that serves to distinguish between the cases. One, however asserts that this idea of continued action is present when the accusative is used, the other, when the genitive is used. The statements of Greenough will be examined in detail and that examination will involve also a criticism of Donaldson.

It will be remembered that Professor Greenough makes the general statement that verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting* take the genitive of the object when they are used of a continued state of mind, but the accusative when used of a single act. This rule he applies to all verbs and expressions of *remembering* and *forgetting*. An examination of the table at the end of my list of examples shows at once that the use varies greatly with different verbs, one never taking the genitive, others taking either the genitive or the accusative in over seventy-five per cent. of the instances. In the first place, therefore, it would seem better to consider each verb separately, for although it is quite probable that in a group of this sort there would be a tendency toward uniformity, it is at least very doubtful if this tendency was sufficiently developed to admit of the setting up of any one rule applicable uniformly to the different members of the group. We may leave this general objection for the present, however, and consider the particular rule set up in this case.

There is no doubt that we often find the accusative when there is but a single act, and likewise the genitive when a state of mind is referred to. It would seem to suffice, however, to show that this is a mere coincidence, or at least not a cause, if one can show examples almost identical in meaning with Mr. Greenough's, in which the other case is employed. This seems to me an easy task.

To begin with, as in the case of our discussion of Haase's theories, we may at once eliminate *recordor* from consideration, since it is never found with the genitive. Hence the first example cited by Greenough in support of his position is unfortunate, for it is Draeger's *recordans superioris transmissionis*, to which reference has been made frequently.

Greenough's next example is

Cic. *D.* I, 30: *Animus meminit praeteritorum.*

But the accusative in exactly the same sense of continued action occurs frequently, as may be seen from the following examples.

Cic. *R.* IV, 1: *Ipsa mens ea, quae futura videt, praeterita meminit.*

Cic. *F.* I, 62: *(Sapiens) et praeterita grata meminit et praesentibus ita potitur, ut . . . .*

Cic. *R.* VI, 10: *Cum senex . . . . omnia eius (Africani) non facta solum, sed etiam dicta meminisset.*

Many others may be quoted. The following are selected at random from different authors:

Pl. *Merc.* 1012: *Suum quisque homo rem meminit.*

*Ad Her.* II, 18, 27 e: *. . . . auditor . . . . unius cuiusque argumentationis distributionem . . . . meminisse poterit.*

In connection with these two last examples, note the following passage, which is instructive as throwing light upon the general meaning of *memini* throughout the treatise, in the last sentence of which it occurs. *Ad Her.* IV, 56: *Quae si sequimur . . . . firme et *perpetue* meminerimus.*

Catullus, *LXIV*, 146-8: *Nil metunt iurare, nihil promittere parent; Dicta nihil meminere, nihil periuria curant.*

Sallust, *B. Cat.* 51, 15: *Sed plerique mortales postrema meminere.*

Cato, *Orig.* II, 1: *Ligures . . . inliterati mendacesque sunt et vera minus meminere.*

Plaut. *Trin.* 697: *Is est honos homini pudico *meminisse officium suum.**

I have cited only instances where the idea of continued action seems to me particularly strong. Perhaps all would not agree

with my interpretation. If so, that would only go to prove the highly subjective character of the distinction and its consequent lack of real value. It would be possible to cite scores of passages where one can determine whether continued action or single act is meant only by the application of some arbitrary rule such as Greenough's.

Below, I give several passages where the genitive is used, referring, in my judgment, to a single act. Here again it is useless to try to give all such passages, for probably no two investigators would always agree in the interpretation.

Ter. *Heaut.* 1024-6: *Si umquam illum fuit tempus, mater, quom ego voluptati tibi fuerim, dictus filius tuos vostra voluntate: obsecro, eius ut memineris atque inopis nunc te miserescat mei.*

Virg. *Aen.* III, 202: *Ipse diem noctemque negat discernere caelo, nec meminisse viae media Palinurus in unda.*

Livy, X, 29, 2: *Galli . . . torpere quidam et nec pugnae meminisse nec fugae.*

Livy, XXXVI, 44, 9: . . . iussit . . . in advenientis hostium naves ferreas manus inicere, et ubi pugnaui pedestri similem fecissent, *meminisse Romanae virtutis.*

Propertius, III, 13, 28: *Possem ego naturae non meminisse tuae.*

Propertius, IV, 19, 1: *Credis eum iam posse tuae meminisse figurae.*

Ovid, *ex Pont.* IV, 4, 10: *possimi fortunae nec meminisse meae.*

(The presence of *possum*, in the three just above, points, it seems to me, to an *act* as against a *state*. One says, "would I could," etc., with reference to *doing*, but more naturally "would I were" with reference to *being*. Or an impersonal construction denoting possibility might be used. "Would it were possible for me to be," but hardly the strong personal *possum*.)

Ovid, *Tr.* IV, 4, 40: *A! sine me fati non meminisse mei!*  
Neve retractando nondum coēuntia rumpam vulnera.

Tac. *Hist.* III, 4, 5: *Flavianus . . . suspiciones militum irritabat, tamquam adfinitatis cum Vitellio meminisset.*

Greenough's only comment on the usage, when persons are referred to, is to say "the accusative is almost always used of a

person or thing remembered by an eyewitness". It is only necessary to refer to the table in which all references to persons are collected. There we find *Elissae*, *Nasonis*, *generi*, *sodalis*, *matris*, *novercae*, *patris*, *consortis* and others which do not support the above rule, to say nothing of the personal pronouns, which are practically always in the genitive.

Let us now turn to *obliviscor*, where the genitive is the rule, there being 64 genitives with this verb and 26 accusatives, not counting neuter pronouns and passages containing the adjective *oblitus*. With this verb therefore the slightest trace of a continued idea might be expected to demand the genitive, if Greenough's rule be correct. But examine this: . . . *in quibus (civibus)* *homines . . . res praeclarissimas* *obliviscuntur*, Cic. *pro Milone*, 63. Here it seems to me that we must admit the presence of the continued idea and yet we have the accusative.

The form *oblitus*, used as an adjective or as a participle is almost invariably followed by the genitive. I have made no attempt to make a complete collection of such instances, merely noting that the genitive was used. I have counted, however, 94 passages in which the adjective or participle *oblitus* governs a case. Only three times is that case the accusative. Once it is a neuter pronoun (Livy, XXII, 58, 8).

Another passage is *Mea facta in acie oblii*—Acc. (Quoted by Nonius). But this is a fragment and *oblii* may be part of a compound tense. The remaining passage is "*pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores*" (Vir. *Georg.* II, 59), where it seems to me that the idea of continued action is the more prominent, in spite of the fact that this almost unique accusative ought, according to the rule under discussion, to point most positively to a single act. In the case of *obliviscor iam tuas iniurias* (Cic. *pro Cael.* 50) it is quite possible to interpret "for the present I am oblivious of your injuries", and a similar interpretation might be urged for *anne bonum oblita's facinus quo regium adept'a's coniugium* (Catullus, LXVI, 26–7).

Below are given a number of passages containing a genitive after *obliviscor*. Only by the most arbitrary methods can Greenough's rule be forced to hold in them.

Cic. *pro Plane*, 101 : *neque umquam obliviscar noctis illius.*

Cic. *Cat.* I, 6 : *obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum.*

Cic. *pro Rab. Post.* 46 : *si iam oblivisci vestrae mansuetudinis.*

(Note here the presence of *iam*, which in the case of *obliviscor iam tuas iniurias* has been cited as pointing to a definite act).

Cic. *Ad Fam.* III, 10, 5 : *Illud vero mihi permirum accidit, tantam temeritatem fuisse in eo . . . tuis iniuriciis suscipiendis oblivisceretur prope omnium fortunarum ac rationum suarum.*

Caes. *B. G.* VII, 34, 1 : *cohortatus Haeduos, ut controversiarum ac dissensionum oblivisceretur.*

Livy, XXXII, 21, 23 : *nostrorum ipsi vulnerum, si vultis, obliviscamur.*

Livy, XXVI, 49, 15 : *quae ne in malis quidem oblitae decoris matronalis estis.*

Tac. *Hist.* II, 67, 10 : *numquam ita ad curas intento Vitellio, ut voluptatum oblivisceretur.*

No attempt has been made to give every instance that runs counter to the proposed rule, because the subjective element enters so largely into the matter. It is significant that this is so, as it goes far toward showing the fallacy of the rule, which is open to criticism in the following points: In the first place it is subjective. What Greenough interprets as referring to a single act, Donaldson says points to continued action. Secondly, it aims to explain in a word the constructions for all the verbs in all periods, where is (1) it is clear that the usage with the different verbs differed radically and that therefore they ought to be treated separately, and (2) I shall presently show that one and the same verb exhibits marked changes in the usage at different periods. But these are general objections. The last and most important one is the fact of constant violation of the proposed rule, all through Latin literature. We have no choice then but to condemn it as unsound.

These criticisms apply equally well to any other attempt to set up a rule based on an alleged difference in meaning between the accusative and genitive when used with these verbs. As has been said before, scholars who distinguish thus do not attempt to

explain how the distinction came to be, therefore we have no theory to examine, but merely statements of fact. And that has been done.

## II.

## CONSTRUCTIVE.

## A.

## Summary of Usage.

An attempt will now be made to classify the examples contained in part two and to summarize the facts that they disclose.

## MEMINI.

The bare figures for the use of *memini* in the different periods are as follows :

	GENITIVE.			ACCUSATIVE.		
	Person.	Thing.	Total.	Person.	Thing.	Total.
Early Latin -----	4	4+1	8+1	2	22+19	24+19
Ciceronian Age -----	8	8	16	14	46+26	60+26
Augustan Age -----	13	29+1	42+1	4	16+8	20+8
Later -----	9	17+3	26+3	2	2+2	4+2
TOTALS -----	34	58+5	92+5	22	86+55	108+55

The sign + indicates that the following numeral refers to neuter pronouns.

*Memini* is regularly followed by the genitive of personal or reflexive pronouns.

This is true eighteen times out of a total of twenty.

The exceptions are :

Plaut. *Aul.* 542: Pro re nitorem et gloriam pro copia qui habent *meminerint sese* unde oriundi sient.

Plaut. *Truc.* 220: Nos divitem istum *meminimus* atque iste pauperes *nos*.

Note, regarding these two exceptions that both are found in early Latin, where the accusative was used 75% of the time. This tendency to use the accusative would be strengthened in the second instance by the strong predicate relation, which would

have demanded the accusative perhaps in any period. Nor is the *sese* in the first instance strictly the object of *meminerint*. This object is rather the whole proleptic construction *sese unde oriundi sient*, which is practically a contamination of (1) an indirect statement, with an accusative and an infinitive, and (2) an indirect question. These are only apparent exceptions therefore, and the rule may be said to hold universally.

Not only neuter pronouns, and adjectives used substantively in the neuter but also neuter nouns are put generally in the accusative case when used as the object of *memini*.

Neuter pronouns occur after *memini* 60 times; 55 times the accusative case is used. The others are *obsecro*, *eius (temporis)* *ut memineris*, Terence, *Heaut.* 1026, where the genitive is necessary to avoid ambiguity; Livy, XXVIII, 29, 6: *obliviscamini eorum* (*eorum* refers to *ea quae fecisti* in the previous sentence); Tac. *Ann.* II, 26, 8: *eorum quoque meminisset (Germanicus) quae venti et fluctus . . . saeva damna intulissent*; Quintilian XI, 2, 20: *Ita quamlibet multa sint, quorum meminisse sporteat*; Ps. Quint. *Decl.* p. 331, l. 3 (Ritter): *meminit eorum quae audierit*. Note that the gender is obvious from the context.

The usage with other neuter expressions including nouns must be studied by periods. The figures are as follows:

EARLY LATIN.	CIC. AND CONTEMP.	AUG. AGE.	LATER
Accusative	14	31	11
Genitive		2	9

Thus we find down to the death of Cicero only two neuter expressions in the genitive after *memini*. They are *animus meminit praeteritorum*, *praesentia cernit*, *futura providet*, Cic. *D.* I, 63; *ut sui iuris dignitatisque meminisset*, Cic. *Verr.* II, 73. This author uses neuter expressions in the accusative 26 times. It does not seem to me to be possible to distinguish his use of the genitive from that of the accusative on the basis of signification. With the former of the above exceptions, compare *ipsa mens ea, quae futura videt*, *praeterita meminit*, Cic. *R.* IV, 1; (*sapiens*) *et praeterita grata meminit et praesentibus ita potitur, ut . . .*

Cic., *F.* I, 62; *ut praeterita meminisse videamur*, Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 47.

Virgil uses the accusative neuter five times and the genitive neuter once. Another apparent case of the genitive with *memini* is found in Virgil, *i. e.*, *nec veterum memini laetorve malorum*, *Aen.* XI, 280. This has been explained however as a causal genitive (a Grecism).

Livy, on the other hand shows a very marked tendency to use the genitive under all circumstances with verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting*. Indeed we find in this author only 3 accusatives as against 30 genitives. Thus it is not surprising to find *virtutis*, *belli temporumque*, *belli*, on the one hand, and only *quanta* on the other.

The same tendency to increase the frequency of the use of the genitive is found also in Ovid and Tacitus. Therefore the statement made regarding neuter substantives must be qualified. Down to the death of Cicero it holds with only the two mentioned exceptions. After that time we find the percentage of genitives used by any given author becoming greater as time goes on. For the entire post-Ciceronian period the total number of genitives occurring equals the accusatives, there being fourteen of each. The adjectives used substantively cling more tenaciously to the accusative than do the nouns. Eliminating Virgil, we find in the Augustan age and later 11 nouns and 2 adjectives in the genitive, while there are only 2 nouns but 6 adjectives in the accusative.

Common nouns, and adjectives used substantively, when referring to persons, are generally put in the genitive case.

Other references to persons, *i. e.*, proper nouns and relative pronouns referring to them, are found in the accusative through Cicero's time.<sup>1</sup> They are generally in the genitive after that. For data regarding the two last statements see the table of personal uses that follows.

<sup>1</sup> There is one apparent exception in Caesar, *B. C.* III, 108, 2. But there the verb is equivalent to *mentionem fecisse*. Sometimes reference to persons is made by the use of *de* and the ablative case.

Regarding all other words used as the object of *memini* one can only say that the accusative was the case prevailingly used with *memini* in early Latin, that this continued to be true down through the Ciceronian period, with a slight increase in the proportion of genitives, that the genitive gained the upper hand during the Augustan age and was almost exclusively used later. See the table at the beginning of the chapter on *memini*.

### *OBLIVISCOR.*

The figures for the complete usage with *obliviscor* are as follows :

Person.	GENITIVE.			ACCUSATIVE.		
	Thing.	Total.	Person.	Thing.	Total.	
Early Latin	2	I	3	3	5+2, I	8+2, I
Ciceronian Age	9, III	24, XIV	33, XVII	0	12+10	14+10
Augustan Age	10, II	12+1, L	22+1, LII	1	1, II	2, II
Later	1, II	4+1 XX	5+1 XXII	0	2+1	2+1
TOTALS	22, VII	41+2, LXXXIV	63+2, XCI	4	20+13, III	26+13, III

*Obliviscor*, when referring to persons regularly takes the genitive case.

There are twenty-one genitives so used and four accusatives. The latter are :

Liv. Andron. *Odisia*, 4 : Neque tamen *te oblitus sum*, Laertie noster.

*Cf.* Homer, Od. I, 65, πῶς ἀν ἔπειτ' Ὁδυσῆος ἐγὼ θείου λαθούμην.

Acc. *Athamas*, II, 190 : Veritus sum arbitros ; atque utinam memet possim *obliscier*.

Acc. *Nyctegresia*, VI, 488 : An ego *Ulixem obliscar* umquam aut quemquam praeponi velim.

*Cf.* Homer, Il. X, 242 or Od. I, 65, as above.

Virgil, *Aen.* II, 148 : Quisquis es, amissos hinc iam *obliviscere Graios*.

Note that all are in poetry, the first three in early Latin, and the last in a speech attributed to Priam.

*Obliviscor*, when referring to things, prefers the genitive, unless the object be a neuter pronoun.

We find one neuter pronoun in the genitive : utinam tam facile vos *obliviscamini corum*, quam ego *obliviscar*. Livy XXVIII, 29, 6 : (*eorum* refers to *ea quae fecisti* in the previous sentence.)

There is no obvious grouping for the remainder, either on the basis of the gender of the noun (as in case of *memini*) or of signification. Early Latin shows 5 accusatives of the thing (not counting neuter pronouns) to 1 genitive. Other periods show a great and growing preference for the genitive.

The figures on which this latter statement is based do not include instances in which the participle *oblitus* is used. As has been said before, it disregards also instances in which a neuter pronoun is the object. Only three times is the participle followed by the accusative : Accius (doubtful); Vir. *Georg.* II, 59; Livy XXII, 58, 8. The latter is a neuter pronoun. If now we include all instances in which any forms of *obliviscor* occurs, governing a case, we find a total of 156 genitives to 40 accusatives, the latter being thus only 20% of the whole. In the two latter periods we have the accusative case only 6.4% of the time, there being 103 genitives to 7 accusatives.

#### Recordor.

This verb takes a direct object only when referring to things. The object is always in the accusative case.

There are 61 instances.

A reference to persons or things, after *recordor*, is sometimes made by the use of *de* and the ablative case.

#### Reminiscor.

This verb is used much less frequently than any of those already mentioned. With it I find 1 accusative of the person, and 7 of the thing, including 1 neuter pronoun. Four times *reminiscor* governs the genitive, always of the thing. In the three first periods, for which data are complete, the figures are 8 accusatives to 2 genitives. Of these genitives one occurs in Caesar (*B. G.* I, 13, 4) and one in Nepos (XIX, 4, 1). The two in later Latin

occur in Tacitus, *Ann.* XI, 36, 2 and Suetonius, *Cl.* 41. Cicero does not use *reminiscor* alone to govern a case, except in *ad Att.* IV, 2, 4, where the case (*Kal. Jan.*) cannot be determined.

### Commemini.

I have noted but 9 passages in which this verb governs a case. Of these 7 are in Plautus and 2 in Cicero. There is one reference to a person. Of the remaining, 6 are neuter pronouns, one a neuter adjective used substantively (*omnia*) and the other, found in Pl. *Trin.* 1027, is *domi*, the only genitive.

TABLE.

Giving in chronological order all words that refer to persons and are used as objects of *memini*, *obliviscor*, or *reminiscor*.  
*Illiæ* indicate that the word is the object of *obliviscor*. † The dagger indicates that the word is the object of *reminiscor*.  
All other forms are objects of *memini*. [ ] Brackets indicate that *memini* – *mentionem facere*.

	<i>GENTITIVE.</i>	<i>Pronouns.</i>	<i>Names.</i>	<i>ACCUSATIVE.</i>
Early Latin.	<i>Names.</i> C. Nouns. (Including Adjs. used substantively.) <i>gnatæ</i> —Ter. <i>mei</i> —“ <i>mei</i> —“	<i>mei</i> —Pl. <i>mei</i> —“ <i>mei</i> —Ter. <i>mei</i> —“ <i>mei</i> —“	<i>Ulium</i> —Acc. <i>Ulium</i> —Dec. Lab. tui—Vano. tui—“ sui —Cie. mei —“ sui —“ mei —“ mei —“ mei —“ mei —“ sui —“ mei —“ [enius] —Caes.	C. Nouns. (Including Adjs. used substantively.) <i>Ulium</i> —Acc. <i>Ulium</i> —Dec. Lab. Paulus —Cie. Cinnam —“ Albinum —“ Sullam —“ Roseum —“ Aelium —“ [enius] —Caes. <i>sui</i> —Vir. <i>sui</i> —Livy. <i>sui</i> —Livy. <i>nostri</i> —Hor. <i>sui</i> —Ovid. <i>mei</i> —“ <i>tui</i> —“ <i>mei</i> —“ <i>mei</i> —“ <i>tui</i> —“ <i>mei</i> —“ <i>mei</i> —“ <i>tui</i> —“
Ciceronian Age.	<i>Epicuri</i> —Cic. vivorum—Cie. generi—“ <i>aliorum</i> —“	<i>vivorum</i> —Cie. generi—“ <i>aliorum</i> —“	<i>sodalis</i> —Ovid. matris —Sen. Rh. novercae—“ <i>novercae</i> —“ <i>matris</i> —“ <i>patris</i> —“ consortis—Manil. aliorum—Livy.	<i>Graios</i> —Vir. <i>Sparsum</i> —Sen. Rh. <i>deos</i> —Propriet. <i>ecqueni</i> —Ovid. † <i>vos</i> —“
Augustan Age.	Hieronis — Pyrri — <i>Decii</i> — <i>Antigoni</i> — Nasonis—Ovid.	Hieronis — Pyrri — <i>Decii</i> — <i>Antigoni</i> — Nasonis—Ovid.	vivorum —Petr. “ —“ <i>fliorum</i> —“ imperitantium—Tac.	mei—Martial. mei—Tac.
Later, (not complete).	Cassii et Brutii—Tac. Ashii, et al. —“ Agrippinae —“ Phratidis, et al. —“	vivorum —Petr. “ —“ <i>fliorum</i> —“ imperitantium—Tac.	Safinium—Petr. avum—Tac. (predicate).	

## B.

## Deductions and Conclusions.

Thus far we have been considering the verbs separately, summarizing the obvious facts regarding each. Can we go further? Here are certain verbs taking now the accusative and now the genitive. Why? When? What follows is an attempt to discover whether or not these questions are answerable.

We may start with a statement to which no one will take exception.

The use of the genitive with these verbs is distinctly a development. Rarely found in earlier times, it becomes so extended ultimately as practically to displace the accusative. In the following table, which shows this very clearly, everything involving *memini*, *obliviscor*, or *reminiscor* is included, even neuter pronouns on the one hand and on the other *oblitus* followed by a case. *Recordor* and *commemini* are not included.

	Accusatives.	Genitives.	Per cent. of Genitives.
Early Latin-----	56	12	17.6
Ciceronian Age -----	112	68	37.7
Augustan Age-----	36	117	76
Later (not complete)---	9	59	86.7

Let us see whether this fact be of any assistance in explaining exceptional uses. Exceptional accusatives ought to be found chiefly in early Latin and exceptional genitives in late Latin, for then they will simply reflect the tendency of the period. Now we have two classes of words showing marked preference for either one case or the other. Personal and reflexive pronouns, with both *memini* and *obliviscor*, take the genitive with great regularity. But there are four exceptions (see discussion under *memini* and *obliviscor*). One is in *Livius Andronicus*, one in *Accius*, and two in *Plautus*. It has been shown that the two latter are hardly exceptions. It is not improbable, however, that this strong tendency to use the accusative may have done its part toward influencing the poet to use these two rather awkward constructions.

On the other hand the accusative is the case prevailingly used of all neuter expressions (nouns as well as pronouns and adjectives) after *memini*. This has been fully discussed under *memini*, where it was shown that in the later periods the genitive gains rapidly on the accusative, getting control first of the neuter nouns, then of the neuter adjectives used substantively, and finally (*Tac. Ann.* II, 26, 8) of neuter pronouns where their neuter origin is obvious from the context.

In commenting on the passages which Nonius quotes as instances of ‘Accusativus pro genitivo’ (Part One, p. 3 f.) attention was called to the fact that while he cites a dozen or more passages under that head, he gives us not one where he thinks there is ‘genitivus pro accusativo.’ This would be only natural if the genitive were in his day used over eighty per cent. of the time. Beyond this the remarks of the grammarian are of little value.

The use of the genitive with these verbs, then, is a development. It is obvious, however, from what has been said already that the development was not equally rapid in all classes of words used as the object of these verbs. Nor was it so in the case of the verbs themselves. Thus *memini* was followed by the genitive only 17 per cent. of the time in early Latin. There was practically no change during the Ciceronian age. Actually there was a slight decrease of 2 per cent. During the Augustan age, however, the percentage of genitives jumped to 60. On the other hand we find *obliviscor*, even in early Latin, followed by the genitive 21 per cent. of the time. This increased to 65 per cent. during the Ciceronian age, and to 93 per cent. for the Augustan. These figures also include both neuter pronouns and instances in which *oblitus* is followed by a case. *Reminiscor* and *commemini* are used too seldom to have any influence, and therefore they are not included in the discussion at this point.

Furthermore the form *oblitus* is present in 75% of the instances in which any part of *obliviscor* occurs, governing a case. Of course *oblitus* used alone, being practically an adjective of *forgetting*, takes the genitive. The step is a very easy one from

*oblitus* with the genitive to *oblitus sum* with the genitive. Much easier for instance than that from *memor* with the genitive to *memini* with the genitive. Is it not probable that these facts stand in the relation of cause to the other fact mentioned above *viz.*, that the development of the use of the genitive with *obliviscor* was much more rapid than with *memini*? Certainly they would lead one to expect to find the genitive so used, and one does find it so used. Let us examine and combine other data at our disposal and see if the logical deductions thence derived have equal foundation in fact.

It has been said already that from earliest times the genitive of personal and reflexive pronouns was the case used with these verbs. To attempt to explain why this is so is a task for the Comparative Philologist. It cannot be deduced from the results of this investigation. For present purposes, however, the fact is enough and the explanation immaterial. Thus, then, we have a certain class of expressions—those referring to persons—in which a very large subdivision<sup>1</sup> almost invariably appeared in the genitive case after these verbs. In the other class, referring to things, we find no subdivision with any such tendency toward the genitive. Now let us conceive of two verbs; first of one that in itself has a strong genitive tendency, and then of one that has not. What is to be expected? Each verb ought to take proportionally more genitives of the person than of the thing, because of the fact above mentioned regarding personal and reflexive pronouns. The tendency ought to be particularly strong in the case of the former, because of its independent leaning toward the genitive. And this is precisely what we find to be the state of affairs; *obliviscor* being found with an accusative of the person only once after early Latin.

An examination of the table containing all cases in point referring to persons shows this very nicely. There we see *obliviscor* rapidly and *memini* more slowly swinging over from the accusa-

---

<sup>1</sup> Personal and reflexive pronouns form about 40% of the total number of words referring to persons.

tive to the genitive construction on the axis, as it were, of the personal and reflexive pronouns. This is probably the true explanation of the difference in treatment of persons and things. We need look for difference in meaning between the two cases no more in the former than in the latter.

We have now at our disposal facts sufficient to enable us to give a rational and satisfactory explanation of the development of this genitive construction. The verbs in the first place governed generally the accusative except in the case of the personal and reflexive pronouns. There were present however two elements making for the genitive; first the participle-adjective *oblitus*, which was always present in the compound tenses of *obliviscor*, next the large proportion of personal and reflexive pronouns. These two forces operated to give rise to and to increase a strong genitive tendency on the part of *obliviscor*. The use of the genitive with *memini* seems to be due partly to the influence of the personal and reflexive pronouns, still more to the influence of its opposite *obliviscor*. Thus we find no increase in the proportion of genitives with *memini* in the Ciceronian period as against early Latin, but in the Augustan age, when the genitive with *obliviscor* had become practically universal, the increase of the genitive with *memini* is very rapid.

This is of course in support of those scholars who would attribute the use of the genitive here to the analogy of its use with adjectives of *remembering* and *forgetting*. And indeed *memor* and *immemor* may very well have helped. Also it does not run counter to those who would see in the genitive with these verbs an indication of a certain inhering substantive idea in the verb. It is quite possible that there was such an idea. But to set up this proposition as the basis of an explanation is again to come dangerously near the subjective method. In the settlement of such a question as this, facts are of prime importance. The facts at hand seem sufficient to explain the development of the construction, which may or may not have been aided by some such subtle influence as suggested.

Turning now to the question as to when the accusative was used and when the genitive, we meet a difficult problem. Viewed broadly the question is easy to answer and has been answered already in these pages. The accusative was used prevailingly in early Latin and the genitive in later Latin, especially in the post-Augustan period. But if we take any one period and attempt to discover on just what principle now the one case was used and now the other for that period; to formulate, in short, a rule, we find the task very difficult. To be sure, there are some classes of words about which fairly definite statements may be made, as, for instance, references to persons after *obliviscor*, personal and reflexive pronouns, and neuter expressions,<sup>1</sup> but that is as far as one can go. In other expressions it is impossible to make a satisfactory distinction on the basis of meaning, or on any other basis. The very fact that this genitive construction is a growth, that we find it the same in no two periods, in itself suggests the impossibility of any fixed rule. If this were the only instance of such uncertainty in syntax, we might well be concerned. We might feel that there must be some hidden principle that had escaped notice. But such uncertainty is very common. Take *similis* for example. "As regards the construction with *similis*, many fine-spun theories have been propounded to account for the difference between *similis* with the Genitive and *similis* with the Dative. The difference, however, is probably merely

---

<sup>1</sup> The common explanation of the fact that neuter expressions are found more commonly in the accusative is satisfactory. Often the neuter character of pronouns or adjectives used substantively would not be obvious if the genitive were used. Neuter nouns may be explained easily also. This would not be so if the genitive had been the case in general use in earliest times, or if the two cases were balanced. Then it would have been difficult to see any special reason for the uniform accusative with these nouns. But granting, as we must, that the accusative was the case prevailingly if not exclusively used at first with verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting*, then it is only natural that neuter nouns, owing to the influence of other neuter expressions, would cling to the accusative. Again, since it is analogy, and not necessity that influences the retention of the accusative with neuter nouns, we might expect to find them the first of neuter expressions to swing over to the genitive. And such is the case. (See discussion of neutrals in Part Three under *memini*, p. 62 f.)

one of chronology and not of meaning. In the earliest Latin we find *similis* construed only with the Genitive. This is Plautus's unvarying usage. Later the use of the Dative begins to creep in, doubtless after the analogy of *pār* and similar words construed with the Dative, and as time goes on the Dative gains the supremacy more and more, until in Silver Latin the Genitive is comparatively rare." (*Appendix to Bennett's Latin Grammar*, § 323.) So we find again and again in language cases where one construction is gradually superseded by another, where we can only point out the various agencies that tend to bring about this result, and where we look in vain for differences of meaning.

It remains now only to append a summary of the foregoing facts, such as might properly be found in a school grammar.

The statements regarding personal and reflexive pronouns, and regarding neuter nouns, also the statement that *recordor* never takes the genitive, and that the phrase *venit mihi in mentem* is colloquial, appear, so far as I know, for the first time here.

## MEMINI, REMINISCOR, OBLIVISCOR, RECORDOR.

### I. When Referring to Persons.

- a. Personal and reflexive pronouns are in the genitive after *memini* and *obliviscor*, except in early Latin.
- b. Other references to persons are regularly in the genitive after *obliviscor* in all periods.

After *memini* the accusative is the rule down through the Ciceronian age. Then the genitive.

| Rarely the person is indicated after *memini* by the ablative and the preposition *de*.

*Reminiscor* was used but rarely. It probably took the accusative case when referring to persons.

### II. When Referring to Things.

*Memini*, *Reminiscor*, and *Obliviscor* use now the genitive and now the accusative, without apparent difference of meaning. *Memini* and *reminiscor* show a decided leaning toward the accusa-

tive except in later Latin. *Obliviscor*, on the other hand, prefers the genitive, except in early Latin. *Reminiscor* is rarely used.

- a. But neuter pronouns, and adjectives used substantively in the neuter gender, regularly stand in the accusative.

Neuter nouns after *memini* are also regularly in the accusative through Cicero's time.

III. Recordor never takes the genitive. It never takes a direct object referring to persons.

NOTE. Sometimes recordor is followed by the ablative and the preposition *de*. Here the reference may be either to persons or things.

IV. Here may be classed the phrase *venit mihi in mentem*, which is sometimes followed by the genitive, probably after the analogy of *memini* and *obliviscor*. The phrase belongs to colloquial speech.

NOTE. It is found about one hundred times in Pl., Ter., and Cic., whereas there are less than a dozen instances in the rest of Latinity, through the Augustan period. Generally the thing remembered is the subject of *venit* and is either a neuter pronoun or an infinitive clause. Rarely the phrase is followed by *de* and the ablative.

## NEW BOOKS FOR THE CLASSICAL LIBRARY

### PHILOLOGICAL.

**GILES.**—A Short Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students. Second Edition, Revised. By P. GILES, University of Cambridge. 12mo, cloth. 619 pp. \$3.25 net.

### TEXTS, WITH NOTES, Etc.

**DEMOSTHENES.**—Selected Orations. On the Peace—Second Philippic—On the Chersonesus and Third Philippic. Edited by JOHN E. SANDYS. \$1.10 net.

**DIONYSIUS.**—Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The Greek Text of the Three Literary Letters, with Translation, Facsimile, Glossary, Bibliography and Introductory Essay by W. R. HYS ROBERTS, editor of Longinus, etc. \$2.50 net.

**EURIPIDES.**—Andromache. A. R. F. HVSLOP, Assistant Master in Harrow School, editor. 60 cents net.

— Cyclops. With Prefatory Essay, Rhythmical Scheme of Lyric Parts, Notes, etc., by JOHN PATTERSON, Louisville, Ky. \$1.25 net.

**GREEK MELIC POETS.** By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Bryn Mawr College. Classical Series. \$2.60 net.

**NEPOS, CORNELIUS.**—Twenty Lives. Edited by JOHN E. BARSS, Hotchkiss School. Illustrated. Macmillan's Latin Series. 90 cents net.

— Miltiades and Epaminondas. Edited with vocabulary, etc., by G. H. NALL. Macmillan's Elementary Classics. 40 cents net.

**SALLUST**—Catiline. Edited by W. C. SUMMERS, Owens College, Manchester. Pitt Press Series. 60 cents net.

— Catiline. Edited with vocabulary, etc. by G. H. NALL. Macmillan's Elementary Classics. 40 cents net.

**SOPHOCLES.** New editions of the *Oedipus Coloneus* and *Antigone* as edited and translated by Prof. R. C. JEBB. Each, \$3.25 net.

### TRANSLATIONS.

**CICERO.**—The Letters of—in Chronological Order. Translated by EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH, author of "The History of Rome," etc. Four volumes. \$6.00 net. Each volume separately \$1.50 net.

**HOMER.** The Iliad and The Odyssey.—Done into English Prose by ANDREW LANG and others. Cheaper Edition, each 80 cents net.

**OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK.**—An Introduction to the. By HENRY BARCLAY SWETE. \$2.50 net.

### HISTORICAL, CRITICAL, Etc.

**BURY.**—A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By I. B. BURY, author of "The Roman Empire." \$1.90 net.

**SWOBODA.**—Greek History. Translated from the German of Prof. HEINRICH SWOBODA, by LIONEL D. BARNETT. With frontispiece. Temple Cyclopaedic Primers. 40 cents, net.

**KOCH.**—Roman History. By Dr. JULIUS KOCH. Translated from the German by LIONEL D. BARNETT. With frontispiece. Temple Cyclopaedic Primers. 40 cents, net.

**WICKHOFF.**—Roman Art. Some of its Principles and Their Application to Early Christian Painting. By FRANZ WICKHOFF. Translated and edited by MRS. S. ARTHUR STRONG, LL.D. With 14 plates and numerous text illustrations. Imperial Svo. Cloth. \$8.00.

---

The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave., New York

# THE Cornell Studies in Classical Philology

EDITED BY

CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT

AND

GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL.

- 
- I. The CUM Constructions: their history and functions, by William Gardner Hale. Part i: Critical, 1887. Part ii: Constructive, 1889.  
Out of Print
- II. Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language, by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, 1887.  
Out of Print
- III. The Cult of Asklepios, by Alice Walton, 1894.  
Price 80 cts.
- IV. The Development of the Athenian Constitution, by George Willis Botsford, 1893.  
Price \$1.50
- V. Index Antiphoniteus: composuit Frank Lovis van Cleef, 1895.  
Price \$1.00
- VI. Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, by Herbert Charles Elmer, 1898.  
Price \$1.50
- VII. The Athenian Secretaries, by William Scott Ferguson, 1898.  
Price 50 cts.
- VIII. The Five Post-Kleisthenian Tribes, by Fred Orlando Bates, 1898.  
Price 50 cts.
- IX. Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories, by Charles Edwin Bennett, 1898.  
Price 50 cts.
- X. The Athenian Archons of the Third and Second Centuries Before Christ, by William Scott Ferguson, 1899.  
Price 75 cts.
- XI. Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia, Confecernut Catherina Maria Gloth, Maria Francisca Kellogg, 1900.  
Price \$1.00
- XII. A Study of the Greek Paean, with Appendixes containing the Hymns found at Delphi and the other extant Fragments of Paearns, by Arthur Fairbanks. 1900.  
Price \$1.00.
- XIII. The Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus, not including Indirect Questions, by Charles L. Durham. 1901.  
Price 80 cts.
- XIV. A Study in Case Rivalry, being an Investigation Regarding the Use of the Genitive and Accusative in Latin with Verbs of *Remembering* and *Forgetting*, by Clinton L. Babcock. 1901.  
Price 60 cts.
- 

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY  
**The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave., New York.**





PA  
25  
C7  
v.14

Cornell studies in  
classical philology

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

